

Also, a bill (H. R. 13128) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Petnecky; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13129) granting an increase of pension to Major C. Hungate; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 13130) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13131) granting an increase of pension to James R. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13132) granting a pension to Charles Augustus Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 13133) granting an increase of pension to Alfred E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13134) granting a pension to Woodson O. Angel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 13135) for the relief of the heirs of James Childers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 13136) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. L. W. Davis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13137) for the relief of the estate of T. W. Quarterman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 13138) for the relief of Pierson Bros. & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 13139) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Van Deusen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13140) granting an increase of pension to Herman Bohlmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13141) for the relief of the heirs of William T. Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 13142) granting an increase of pension to Mary Macombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13143) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Connors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13144) granting an increase of pension to Mary Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13145) granting an increase of pension to William S. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKETT: A bill (H. R. 13146) granting an increase of pension to Asa G. Canfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 13147) granting a pension to George W. Lusk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 13148) for the relief of James Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13149) granting a pension to Joe Griffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13150) granting a pension to Squire Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13151) granting a pension to George A. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13152) granting a pension to Edward T. Crouch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13153) granting an increase of pension to Sherman G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13154) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Parrott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13155) for the relief of William Gardner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13156) for the relief of Robert H. Donnelly; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13157) for the relief of John W. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13158) for the relief of Arthur Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13159) to correct the military record of Frederick F. Loftis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13160) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of Keith Spalding and sundry other citizens of Tinley Park, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the inspection of nursery stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Walter H. Fearn, M. D., in favor of House resolution 220; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of San Francisco Branch, United States Civil Service Retirement Association, against House bills 1696 and 1713, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution of American Medical Association, relating to the food and drugs act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Union, Nebr., requesting a reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE: Papers to accompany House bill 13031, granting an increase of pension to Ford P. Hoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13032, granting an increase of pension to George E. Willey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13033, granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13034, granting an increase of pension to Thomas Whissell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13035, for the relief of Bennett F. Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Papers to accompany House bill 13160, granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, August 1, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EMPLOYEES IN IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, in partial compliance with a resolution of the Senate of June 23, 1910, a report dealing with the wages and hours of labor in the principal occupations in the iron and steel industry in the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) making appropriations for certain expenses of the House of Representatives incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress; agrees to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; disagrees to the residue of the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and had appointed Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. CANNON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

LEMON INDUSTRY IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, a few minutes before adjournment last evening the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] offered an amendment to the pending House free-list bill placing lemons on the free list. The amendment has not been considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the House nor by the Finance Committee of the Senate. It seems to me an unfair advantage that the representatives of this great industry should not have an opportunity of being heard upon it.

As under the agreement we are debarred from speaking upon questions of amendment to-day, I ask permission of the Senate to insert in the RECORD the following letter addressed to me, with accompanying data, giving the imports and value of lemons during the last two years, the amount of revenue to the Government therefrom, and also the present status of the supply of lemons from California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the letter and accompanying data will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AUGUST 1, 1911.

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: As representing the citrus-fruit growers of California, I beg to submit for your information the following:

The producers of California citrus fruit desire an opportunity of being heard before any action is taken by the present session of Congress on the schedule affecting citrus fruit. They are now causing to be tabulated data statistics covering all features and phases of the lemon industry, in both California and Sicily, and from the ground to the consumer. To get this vast amount of data in succinct and intelligent form requires the expenditure of a good deal of time and a large amount of labor, and we respectfully submit that full hearing of all pertinent facts should be accorded the domestic producers.

The output of California citrus fruits this year is the greatest in its history, a total of about forty-odd thousand carloads of oranges and about 7,000 carloads of lemons being shipped. The amount of capital invested in the citrus-fruit industry in California is approximately

\$166,800,000. One hundred and fifty thousand citizens of the United States and residents of the State of California are directly dependent on that industry for a livelihood.

Regarding California lemons specifically, will say that the production has increased about 25 per cent since the Payne-Aldrich Act took effect, with also an increase in planting since the same date of 30 per cent. Before the tariff of 1½ cents per pound on foreign lemons went into effect California was producing about 40 per cent of the lemons consumed in the United States, and since that time about 50 per cent of the entire consumption.

FOREIGN LEMONS.

The records of the United States Treasury Department will show that the increase in imports of foreign lemons was about 25,000,000 pounds for the year immediately following the passage of the Payne-Aldrich Act, as compared with the year immediately preceding. But to bring it down to the present time, will note from the records of the New York Fruit Exchange:

	Boxes.
Receipts of foreign lemons at port of New York, June, 1909.....	238,500
Receipts of foreign lemons at port of New York, June, 1910.....	307,000
Receipts of foreign lemons at port of New York, June, 1911.....	359,000
Receipts of foreign lemons July 1 to 28, 1910.....	265,920
Receipts of foreign lemons July 1 to 28, 1911.....	387,525

By reference to these figures it will readily be seen that imports have greatly increased under the duty of 1½ cents per pound.

REVENUE.

The revenue collected on imported lemons during the fiscal year 1909 was \$1,350,738.88, and in 1910 (which comprehended 11 months after the passage of the Payne-Aldrich Act) the duty collected amounted to \$2,233,526.87, the largest revenue ever collected in any one fiscal year on imported lemons.

PRICE.

Without going into this feature extensively, I just wish to call to your attention prices which each and every Member of Congress can himself readily verify. In the city of Washington, D. C., in the immediate neighborhood of Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., good quality, 300 and 360 sizes, lemons have at no time for many months past been higher than 15 cents per dozen, frequently at 10 cents per dozen, but a general average price would be 12 cents per dozen. These low prices to the consumer have prevailed only since the Payne-Aldrich Act went into effect. The yield of apples in the United States last year was 23,825,000 barrels, and, with no import duty on this variety of fruit, they have practically for many months been selling for 5 cents an individual fruit; or, in other words, the cost of two to three apples equals the cost of a dozen lemons. In further confirmation of low prices of lemons since the Payne-Aldrich Act became effective, will note that the selling price of lemons during the week preceding the 4th of July is generally one of the highest of the summer, and for that week, ending July 1, 1911 (duty 1½ cents per pound), the average f. o. b. price per box for California lemons was \$1.47 less than the average f. o. b. during the same period in 1909 (duty 1 cent per pound).

Very truly, yours,

W. L. MOULTON.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF VISIBLE SUPPLY OF LEMONS AND RANGE OF PRICES JUNE 24, 1911, NEW YORK.

This table shows that lemons have decreased in cost to the consumer during a period of four years, the last two years being under the Payne-Aldrich tariff rate of 1½ cents per pound. Note the price of \$4.40 per box in 1907 for choice firsts as compared with \$3.87½ in 1911.

Also note the increased product of California—only 39,680 boxes on the New York market June 24, 1907, as against 97,600 June 24, 1911.

	1911	1910	1909	1908	1907
Sicily: Available for sale next 3 weeks.	248,000	175,000	174,550	214,000	302,250
California: Shipments 7 days ending Wednesday, 305 cars.....	97,600	64,640	65,600	32,640	39,680
Total.....	347,600	239,640	240,150	246,640	341,930

Carloads of California lemons taken as of 320 boxes each.

Range of prices for Sicily lemons at closing sale of week ending June 24, 1911, and corresponding weeks in previous years.

	1911	1910	1909	1908	1907
First choice, 300s.....	\$3.87½-\$5.00	\$3.75-\$7.12½	\$3.40-\$5.05	\$2.60-\$3.50	\$4.40-\$5.00
Second choice, 300s.....	3.00-4.37½	4.87½-6.00	2.60-3.65	2.05-2.50	3.35-4.40
First choice, 360s.....	4.37½-5.50	5.50-6.75	3.40-5.05	2.50-3.25	4.20-5.00
Second choice, 360s.....	3.25-4.37½	4.62½-5.62½	2.90-3.90	2.05-2.40	3.15-4.30
Fair to best, small sizes	3.12½-5.00	4.50-6.25	3.00-5.00	2.10-3.25	
Wasty lots down to.....	1.87½	3.00		1.30	

Shipments of lemons from southern California from 1897 to 1910, inclusive.

Years.	Cars.	Estimated number of boxes (312 per car).	Estimated number of pounds (84 pounds per box).
1897-98.....	1,166	363,792	30,558,528
1898-99.....	903	281,736	23,665,824
1899-1900.....	1,447	451,464	37,922,976
1900-1901.....	2,924	912,288	76,632,192
1901-2.....	2,816	878,592	73,801,728
1902-3.....	2,649	826,488	69,424,992
1903-4.....	2,782	867,984	72,910,656
1904-5.....	4,274	1,333,488	112,012,992
1905-6.....	3,789	1,182,168	99,302,112
1906-7.....	3,507	1,094,184	91,911,456
1907-8.....	4,959	1,547,208	129,965,472
1908-9.....	6,196	1,933,152	162,384,768
1909-10.....	4,782		

A BRIEF RECAPITULATION OF THE LEMON INDUSTRY IN CALIFORNIA, WITH REFERENCE TO ACREAGE PLANTED AND AVAILABLE FOR LEMON GROWING IN THAT STATE.

The lemon industry was established in California about 20 years ago. In the course of 10 years 6,500 acres were planted in the southern portion of the State. The Dingley Tariff Act encouraged development, and the acreage amounted in 1892 to 15,000 acres. It was then found that the tariff rate of 1 cent per pound was not sufficient protection and the acreage decreased until in 1904 there were only about 9,200 acres.

At this point in the history of the lemon industry the transcontinental railroads awoke to the fact that it was but a question of time until the cultivation of lemons in California would cease; and they reduced the rate on this product from \$1.25 to \$1 per pound from points in California to points in the United States and Canada. With this incentive, the acreage increased until in 1909 we had 16,700 acres, with an annual output of 1,585,000 boxes. Since the passage of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, which increased the duty on lemons to 1½ cents per pound, the increased output of California lemons has been 25 per cent, and the acreage planted has been increased 30 per cent; and instead of supplying only about 30 per cent of the demand in the United States, California now supplies nearly 50 per cent.

The following statement of lemon plantings in California in 1909-10 and of available acreage suitable for the production of lemons, shows the progress that has been made under proper protection.

Counties.	Plantings last two years.	Plantings arranged for next spring.	Total.	Dec. 31, 1910—Available land for lemon growing on which water is or can be developed.
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
San Diego.....	100	300	400	8,000
Santa Barbara.....	30	150	180	1,000
Tulare.....	200	500	700	(?)
Riverside.....	500	1,000	1,500	5,000
San Bernardino.....	100	200	300	2,000
Orange.....	250	500	750	10,000
Los Angeles.....	1,200	2,000	3,200	10,000
Ventura.....	1,000	500	1,500	20,000
Total.....	3,380	5,150	8,530	56,000

¹ The lemons in Tulare County are produced almost entirely in one crop in the fall. There is practically unlimited land there, no great proportion of which will probably ever be set out on account of the comparatively small consumption of lemons at that season of the year. When the plantings now being made in that section come into bearing, we will have a solution of the problem of the high prices that have heretofore prevailed in the period between the old and new crops of southern California and Sicily.

Table showing comparative monthly consumption of domestic and foreign lemons.

Months.	Imported lemons.		California lemons.		Total consumption.	
	Per cent imports.	Carloads, crop 1908.	Per cent sold.	Carloads, crop.	Total cars each month.	Per cent of year's supply for month.
January.....	4	280	9	450	730	6.08
February.....	4.7	329	9	450	779	6.49
March.....	8.1	567	7.5	375	942	7.85
April.....	11.2	704	7.5	375	1,150	9.65
May.....	14	960	11.5	575	1,555	12.96
June.....	18	1,200	12.5	625	1,825	15.71
July.....	16.4	1,148	13.5	675	1,823	15.20
August.....	9.5	665	4.5	225	890	7.43
September.....	4	280	3.5	175	455	3.80
October.....	2.8	196	7	350	546	4.55
November.....	4	280	8.5	425	705	5.85
December.....	3.3	231	6	300	531	4.43
Total.....	100.0	7,000	100.0	5,000	12,000	100.00

THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

Mr. LIPPITT. I give notice that to-morrow, after the routine morning business, I shall submit some remarks on the proposed amendments to the cotton schedule.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of American and British residents of Honolulu, Hawaii, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by the Arizona Wool Growers' Association July 7, 1911, remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation proposing to reduce the tariff on wool and meats until the Tariff Commission shall make its report upon these subjects, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented the petitions of J. E. Butler, of North White Plains; M. M. Josephs, of Rochester; of Dr. J. F. Halley, F. Beyer, S. Jacobs, H. Geller, C. L. Perillo, M. Cohen, M. H. Brown, A. A. Greene, M. Stembler, Charles W. Massey, G. A. Ellison, P. Hogan, R. M. Drew, I. Nadel, G. Baker, W. Cooke, H. Wehl, J. Frank, E. S. Fleisser, J. J. Zeller, E. A. Marks, M. Golomb, E. J. Maloney, J. Smith, H. J. Lloyd, and A. Cohen, of Brooklyn; of J. G. Bentz, P. Henry, P. J.

Quinn, J. A. McEntyre, W. B. Wilson, J. J. Fraley, J. C. Jack, M. Levin, M. Rose, W. J. Harber, J. J. Zieger, J. Sweeney, B. Cohen, R. Levin, F. Nevins, J. Hughes, T. J. Barry, P. Gray, J. O. Murphy, J. J. Lee, J. J. Siegel, C. M. Boyle, Joseph White, H. T. Miller, D. Weil, F. Kohler, E. Roth, S. E. Allen, J. Bail, J. Spencer, R. Johnson, S. Witt, and F. Schaefer, of New York City, all in the State of New York, praying for the repeal of the duty on lemons, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the memorial of E. M. Hamlin and sundry other citizens of Bellefourche, S. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday-rest bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the Alameda County Pharmaceutical Society, of California, remonstrating against the imposition of a stamp tax on proprietary medicines, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIVELY presented resolutions adopted at a convention of the Middle States Textile Manufacturers' Association, held at French Lick Springs, Ind., praying for the establishment of a permanent Tariff Commission, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROOT presented 96 petitions of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., and 133 petitions of citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the duty on lemons, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS.

Mr. BRIGGS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 119, submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETE on the 27th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Census be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at a salary of \$1,200 per annum.

MESSENGER TO COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. BRIGGS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 70, submitted by Mr. GAMBLE on the 16th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger at a salary of \$1,440 per annum.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. BRIGGS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 122, submitted by Mr. CUMMINS (for Mr. CLAPP) on the 28th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be hereby authorized to employ an assistant clerk at a salary of \$1,200 per annum.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 3131) granting an increase of pension to Ira Flag (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 3132) granting a pension to Deborah B. Roman; and

A bill (S. 3133) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Osborne (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 3134) granting an increase of pension to Myron Richards;

A bill (S. 3135) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Vose; and

A bill (S. 3136) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Presson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 3137) granting an increase of pension to John H. Mumaw;

A bill (S. 3138) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ball;

A bill (S. 3139) granting an increase of pension to Pauline G. Murphy;

A bill (S. 3140) granting an increase of pension to George McCrea;

A bill (S. 3141) granting an increase of pension to Emily B. Smith;

A bill (S. 3142) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Hill; and

A bill (S. 3143) granting a pension to Sarah McLean (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3144) granting an increase of pension to William Boyd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNTER:

A bill (S. 3145) for the relief of W. J. Vanhooze, heir of Felt Vanhooze (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3146) granting a pension to John Burke (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3147) granting an increase of pension to Charles Blair (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 3148) granting an increase of pension to Horace H. Warren; to the Committee on Pensions.

(By request.) A bill (S. 3149) providing for the retirement of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3150) to extend time of payment of balance due for lands sold under act of Congress approved June 17, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3151) to extend time of payment of balance due for lands sold under act of Congress approved June 17, 1910 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) authorizing a per capita distribution of the tribal funds of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Seminole Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MESSENGERS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. PAYNTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 125), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That each of the following-named committees is hereby authorized to employ a messenger at a salary of \$1,200 per annum: Standards, Weights, and Measures; on the Mississippi River and its Tributaries; on Railroads; on the University of the United States; on Pacific Railroads; to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service; on Indian Depredations; to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands; on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard; and on the Geological Survey; and that said salaries be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

TARIFF DUTIES ON WOOL.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document (S. Doc. No. 82) a comparative table respecting the duties on wool in Canada and the United States. It has been already printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator. I should like to have him repeat it.

Mr. GORE. I ask to have printed as a public document the comparative table which I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few days ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The order is entered.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives agreeing to the amendment of the Senate No. 1, agreeing to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 with an amendment, disagreeing to the residue of the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) making appropriations for certain expenses of the House of Representatives incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate No. 2; insist upon its amendments to the joint resolution; agree to the conference asked for by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. CULBERSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF DUTIES.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, it was my intention to offer as an amendment to the free-list bill, which is to be voted upon to-day, the amendment which I submitted on July 25,

providing for the reduction at the rate of one-tenth per annum of all duties the importations under which do not equal one-tenth of the total domestic production of the United States, but yielding to the general sentiment upon this side of the Senate that the free-list bill should not be embarrassed by amendments relating to other schedules or general amendments, I have concluded to reserve the amendment to be offered later on upon the cotton bill or such other legislation as may be presented to the Senate by the House.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I ask if the morning business has closed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not. Is there other morning business? The morning business is closed and the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4413.

THE FREE LIST.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Cummins	Lodge	Rayner
Bailey	Curtis	Lorimer	Reed
Bankhead	Davis	McCumber	Richardson
Borah	Dillingham	McLean	Root
Bourne	Dixon	Martin, Va.	Shively
Brandegee	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Briggs	Foster	Myers	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Gamble	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Gore	Newlands	Smoot
Bryan	Gronna	Nixon	Stephenson
Burnham	Guggenheim	O'Gorman	Stone
Burton	Heyburn	Oliver	Swanson
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Overman	Taylor
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Thornton
Clapp	Johnston, Ala.	Page	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Paynter	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Penrose	Watson
Crane	Kern	Perkins	Wetmore
Crawford	La Follette	Poinindexter	Works
Cullum	Lippitt	Pomerene	

Mr. TAYLOR. My colleague [Mr. LEA] is absent from the city on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act the following articles shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horseshoes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the following amendment and ask that it may lie on the table. I wish to have it read. I will call it up later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator does not now offer the amendment? The Chair thinks it is not in order, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to offer amendments to be laid over.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer it now, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota offers an amendment, which the Secretary will read.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 9, after the word "articles," strike out the words "not sweetened," so as to make the paragraph read:

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, after the word "shoes," in line 16, strike out the words "made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins, and," so as to read:

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes; harness, saddles, and saddlery, etc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRONNA. At the bottom of page 3, I move to add:

Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic cement, and lime.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be again stated.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota asks for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

The SECRETARY. On page 3, after line 18, it is proposed to add the following:

Coal and coke of all kinds, including coal slack and compositions used for fuel in which coal or coal dust is the component material of chief value.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Secretary read the amendment very hurriedly. I ask that it be again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will again state the amendment.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. By arrangement with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], who is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY], I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire to the Senator from Mississippi and will vote. I vote "nay." I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Because of my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] I am unable to vote upon this amendment or upon any other amendment that may be offered to the bill or on the question of the final passage of the bill. I make this announcement at this time for the day. I will add that if the Senator from South Carolina were present, and I were at liberty to vote, I should vote against this amendment, and I should also vote against the final passage of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON (when Mr. DU PONT's name was called). My colleague [Mr. DU PONT] is necessarily absent from the Chamber. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay." I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GALLINGER] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS], which pair, I understand, has been transferred to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I am paired on all votes to-day with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. SMOOT (when Mr. SUTHERLAND's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] received notice of the death of his father yesterday and left for home yesterday evening. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER]. I shall allow this notice to stand for the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. RAYNER (after having voted in the negative). I voted by mistake, as I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

Mr. BACON. I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bailey	Crawford	Gronna	Martine, N. J.
Borah	Cummins	Hitchcock	Nelson
Bristow	Dixon	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman
Brown	Fletcher	Kenyon	Owen
Bryan	Gamble	La Follette	Pomerene
Clapp	Gore	McCumber	Watson

NAYS—52.

Bacon	Cullom	Myers	Simmons
Bankhead	Curtis	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Bourne	Davis	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Foster	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Guggenheim	Overman	Smoot
Briggs	Heyburn	Page	Stone
Burnham	Johnson, Ala.	Paynter	Swanson
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Taylor
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Poindexter	Thornton
Chilton	Lodge	Reed	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lorimer	Richardson	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	McLean	Root	Wetmore
Crane	Martin, Va.	Shively	Works

NOT VOTING—14.

Culberson	Gallinger	Percy	Tillman
Dillingham	Kern	Rayner	Williams
du Pont	Lea	Stephenson	
Frye	Penrose	Sutherland	

So Mr. GRONNA's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

Apples, peaches, quinces, cherries, plums, pears, berries, cranberries, and pineapples, in their natural condition.

Lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, and shaddock, or pomelos.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there other amendments to be offered?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move, beginning with the word "beef," in line 1, on page 3, to strike out all down to and including the word "meats," in line 5 of page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Beginning at the top of page 3, it is proposed to strike out the following paragraph:

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, on that amendment I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "nay."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). I make the same announcement as before regarding my colleague [Mr. GALLINGER], and will state that if he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYN-

TER], who is unavoidably detained. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], but I understand he would vote "nay" if present. Therefore I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 14, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Bailey	Clapp	Gamble	La Follette
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Townsend
Bourne	Cummins	Jones	
Bristow	Dixon	Kenyon	

NAYS—63.

Bacon	Davis	Myers	Shively
Bankhead	Fletcher	Nelson	Simmons
Bradley	Foster	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Gore	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Gronna	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Hitchcock	Oliver	Smoot
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Stephenson
Burnham	Johnson, Ala.	Owen	Stone
Burton	Kern	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Perkins	Taylor
Chilton	Lodge	Poindexter	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Lorimer	Pomerene	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Rayner	Watson
Crane	McLean	Reed	Wetmore
Cullom	Martin, Va.	Richardson	Works
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Root	

NOT VOTING—13.

Culberson	Gallinger	Penrose	Williams
Dillingham	Guggenheim	Percy	
du Pont	Lea	Sutherland	
Frye	Paynter	Tillman	

So Mr. BAILEY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move to strike out, beginning with the word "buckwheat," in line 6, down to and including the word "sweetened," in line 9, on page 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out the following paragraph:

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. BAILEY. In view of the other vote, I will not ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. I move to strike out the period after the word "sweetened," in line 9, page 3, and insert a comma and the words "and lemons," so as to put lemons on the free list.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas offers an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 9, after the word "sweetened," insert the words "and lemons."

Mr. BAILEY. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "nay."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). I make the same announcement in regard to my colleague.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER], I withhold my vote.

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON. I again announce, and will let it stand for all subsequent votes, the pair between the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—15.

Bailey	Clapp	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman
Borah	Crawford	McCumber	Owen
Bourne	Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Pomerene
Brown	Gronna	Nelson	

NAYS—59.

Bacon	Burnham	Cummins	Heyburn
Bankhead	Burton	Davis	Hitchcock
Bradley	Chamberlain	Dixon	Johnson, Ala.
Brandeggee	Chilton	Fletcher	Jones
Briggs	Clark, Wyo.	Foster	Kern
Bristow	Crane	Gamble	La Follette
Bryan	Cullom	Gore	Lippitt

Lodge	Overman	Simmons	Taylor
Lorimer	Page	Smith, Md.	Thornton
McLean	Perkins	Smith, Mich.	Townsend
Martin, Va.	Poindexter	Smith, S. C.	Warren
Myers	Reed	Smoot	Watson
Newlands	Richardson	Stephenson	Wetmore
Nixon	Root	Stone	Works
Oliver	Shively	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—16.

Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Lea	Rayner
Culberson	Gallinger	Paynter	Sutherland
Dillingham	Guggenheim	Penrose	Tillman
du Pont	Kenyon	Percy	Williams

So Mr. BAILEY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move to amend by striking out all of lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, on page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, beginning with line 10, it is proposed to strike out the following paragraph:

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vite, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. On page 3, line 11, I move to strike out the word "shingles."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 11, strike out the word "shingles."

Mr. JONES. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "nay."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). I make the same announcement in regard to my colleague.

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce as applicable to all votes taken to-day that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY] is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 72, as follows:

YEAS—6.

Borah	Heyburn	Lorimer	Oliver
Bourne	Jones		

NAYS—72.

Bacon	Cullom	Lodge	Richardson
Bailey	Cummins	McCumber	Root
Bankhead	Curtis	McLean	Shively
Bradley	Davis	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Brandegee	Dixon	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Briggs	Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Foster	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Gamble	Newlands	Smoot
Bryan	Gore	Nixon	Stephenson
Burnham	Gronna	O'Gorman	Stone
Burton	Guggenheim	Overman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Owen	Taylor
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thornton
Clapp	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Perkins	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Poindexter	Watson
Crane	La Follette	Pomerene	Wetmore
Crawford	Lippitt	Reed	Works

NOT VOTING—12.

Culberson	Frye	Penrose	Sutherland
Dillingham	Gallinger	Percy	Tillman
du Pont	Lea	Rayner	Williams

So the amendment of Mr. JONES was rejected.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move to amend by striking out, on page 3, commencing with the word "sawed," in line 12, down to and including the word "except," in line 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 12, after the word "posts," strike out the following words: "sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except," so as to read:

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vite, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments to be offered as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and it was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BAILEY. I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "yea."

Mr. RICHARDSON (when Mr. DU PONT's name was called). I again announce the pair of my colleague [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. GALLINGER], if present, would vote "nay." He is paired, as has been stated, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY].

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, it resulted—yeas 39, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Bacon	Gore	Nelson	Simmons
Bankhead	Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Brown	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Stone
Chamberlain	Johnston, Ala.	Owen	Swanson
Chilton	Kern	Paynter	Taylor
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Poindexter	Thornton
Davis	Martin, Va.	Pomerene	Watson
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Reed	Works
Foster	Myers	Shively	

NAYS—39.

Bailey	Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Kenyon	Richardson
Bourne	Crawford	La Follette	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Cummins	Lodge	Smoot
Briggs	Curtis	Lorimer	Stephenson
Bristow	Dixon	McLean	Townsend
Burnham	Gamble	Nixon	Warren
Burton	Guggenheim	Oliver	Wetmore
Clapp	Heyburn	Page	

NOT VOTING—12.

Culberson	Frye	Penrose	Sutherland
Dillingham	Gallinger	Percy	Tillman
du Pont	Lea	Rayner	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the passage of the bill the yeas are 39, the nays are 39. The nays have it, and the bill fails to pass.

Mr. GRONNA. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota can not make that motion, he not having voted on the prevailing side.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate decided against the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin moves to reconsider the vote by which the bill failed to pass.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I desire to offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the third reading was ordered is reconsidered. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, in lieu of the paragraph contained in lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, insert:

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes, sausage and sausage meats, coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States, free of duty, cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, the Secretary has not read my amendment. I wish he would read the language in which I offered it.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. President, I move to amend House bill 4413 as follows:

By repunctuating the clause commencing with the word "beef," in the first line of page 3 of the printed bill, and ending with the word "meats," in line 5 on said page, and adding thereto the following

words: "coming from any foreign country which shall admit from the United States, free of duty, cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs;" so that said clause when so amended shall read as follows:

"Beef, veal, mutton, lamb—"

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will inquire as to whether this is an amendment in an amendment proposed to the pending bill or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not think it is so intended to be. The amendment has already been read, and I understand that this is something that is being offered elsewhere.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is an amendment to the pending bill, offered as such, the Chair understands. The Secretary will continue reading the amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. Is it being read again? It was read once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator who offered the amendment thought the Clerk had not reported it as it had been presented, and asked that it be read in full just as presented, which the Clerk is now doing.

Mr. KERN. I noticed a clerical error that the words interpolated in the clause as it would read if amended are not interpolated in the amendment itself. So I asked that it might be read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reading will be continued.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. President, I move to amend House bill 4413, as follows:

By repunctuating the clause commencing with the word "beef," in the first line of page 3 of the printed bill, and ending with the word "meats," in line 5 on said page, and adding thereto the following words: "coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs"; so that that clause when so amended will read as follows:

"Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes, sausage and sausage meats, coming from any country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs."

Also, by repunctuating the clause commencing with the word "buckwheat," in line 6 on page 3 of the printed bill, and ending with the word "sweetened," in line 9 on said page, and adding thereto the following words: "coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs"; so that said clause, when so amended, shall read as follows:

"Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods, and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles, not sweetened, coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and others called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "yea."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GALLINGER], if present and voting, would vote "nay." He is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY].

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. I would vote "yea" if the junior Senator from Utah were present.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 49, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	Shively
Bailey	Davis	McCumber	Simmons
Bankhead	Dixon	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Borah	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Stone
Bourne	Foster	Myers	Swanson
Bristow	Gamble	Nelson	Taylor
Brown	Gronna	Newlands	Thornton
Bryan	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Townsend
Chamberlain	Johnson, Ala.	Overman	Watson
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Works
Clapp	Jones	Paynter	
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Pomerene	
Crawford	Kern	Reed	

NAYS—29.

Bradley	Curtis	Nixon	Smith, S. C.
Brandegge	Gore	Oliver	Smoot
Briggs	Guggenheim	Page	Stephenson
Burnham	Heyburn	Perkins	Warren
Burton	Lippitt	Polindexter	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Richardson	
Crane	Lorimer	Root	
Cullom	McLean	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—12.

Culberson	Frye	Penrose	Sutherland
Dillingham	Gallinger	Percy	Tillman
du Pont	Lea	Rayner	Williams

So Mr. KERN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move to amend, on page 1, before the comma at the end of line 6, by inserting the words "and binders."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, after the word "harvesters," and before the comma, insert the words "and binders."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert:

Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic cement, and lime.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed, on page 2, after the word "shoes," in line 16, to strike out the words "made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calf skins; and"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. One moment, if the Senator from Oklahoma will excuse the Chair. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which my amendment to put lemons on the free list was defeated. As the Senate now seems willing to amend the bill, I am sure it will be glad—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] had been recognized for an amendment. The Chair thought the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] had risen to say something in reference to the vote just taken.

Mr. BAILEY. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news-print paper and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I demand the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. I ask that the amendment may be again stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will again state the amendment.

The Secretary again stated the amendment proposed by Mr. GORE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). I desire to again make the same announcement previously made by me in reference to the pair of my colleague [Mr. GALLINGER] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS], having been transferred to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY].

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON. Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bristow	Dixon	La Follette	Reed
Brown	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Swanson
Bryan	Gore	Myers	Taylor
Clapp	Gronna	Newlands	Watson
Crawford	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	
Cummins	Kenyon	Owen	
Davis	Kern	Pomerene	

NAYS—53.

Bacon	Crane	McLean	Smith, Md.
Bailey	Cullom	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Curtis	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Foster	Nixon	Smoot
Bourne	Gamble	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Guggeheim	Overman	Stone
Brandegee	Heyburn	Page	Thornton
Briggs	Hitchcock	Paynter	Townsend
Burnham	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Warren
Burton	Jones	Poindexter	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Richardson	Works
Chilton	Lodge	Root	
Clark, Wyo.	Lorimer	Shively	
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—12.

Culberson	Frye	Penrose	Sutherland
Dillingham	Gallinger	Percy	Tillman
du Pont	Lea	Rayner	Williams

So Mr. GORE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following:

Type, linotype and typesetting machines, and printing presses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on yesterday I submitted two amendments to the pending bill, one of which I shall not call up to-day because it has been substantially covered. It relates to Canada. The other amendment I ask to have read, and I desire now to submit it as an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

Mr. GORE. I offer the amendment relating to commercial union between the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. LODGE. What question is pending, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma has offered an amendment which the Secretary is about to state.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. —. That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government or Governments of any or all nations of the American hemisphere have declared a desire to establish commercial union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties or with uniform duties upon trade between the United States and such nations, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent such Government or Governments, to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal-revenue taxes of such countries, and an equitable division of receipts, in a commercial union; and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I submit that that amendment is not germane to the pending proposition and is not in order under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question of germaneness must be submitted to the Senate. Senators who think the amendment is germane will say "aye" and those opposed "no." [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I rise to withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn, and it is also ruled out of order by the Senate. Does the Senator desire to offer his other amendment?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I recall that it was a record vote which was taken when I moved to insert "lemons"; and, as I voted with the losing side, I can not move to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At another stage of the proceedings the Senator need not move to reconsider.

Mr. BAILEY. I need not move to reconsider, but I can move the amendment at this time in the Senate. I move, on page 3, line 9, to insert, after the word "sweetened," the words "and lemons," and a comma instead of a period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 9, after the word "sweetened," it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "and lemons."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 6, after the words "buckwheat flour," it is proposed to insert:

Rice, cleaned; uncleaned rice, or rice free of the outer hull and still having the inner cuticle on; rice flour, rice meal, and broken rice; paddy, or rice having the outer hull on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I should like to have the amendment again stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will again state the amendment.

The Secretary again stated the amendment of Mr. LODGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "nay."

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KERN (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to change my vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to change my vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to change my vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to change my vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bailey	Cullom	Kenyon	Paynter
Borah	Cummins	La Follette	Pomerene
Bourne	Curtis	Lodge	Reed
Bristow	Dixon	Myers	Root
Brown	Gamble	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Gore	Newlands	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Gronna	O'Gorman	
Crawford	Johnson, Me.	Owen	

NAYS—45.

Bacon	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Bankhead	Foster	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Heyburn	Overman	Stone
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Page	Swanson
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Taylor
Burnham	Jones	Poindexter	Thornton
Chamberlain	Kern	Richardson	Townsend
Chilton	Lippitt	Shively	Watson
Clapp	Lorimer	Simmons	Works
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Smith, Md.	
Crane	McLean	Smith, Mich.	
Davis	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—15.

Briggs	Frye	Nixon	Sutherland
Culberson	Gallinger	Penrose	Tillman
Dillingham	Guggeheim	Percy	Williams
du Pont	Lea	Rayner	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS. In lieu of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and at the same place in the bill, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment which the Secretary will report.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 6, after the words "buckwheat flour," it is proposed to insert the following:

Boston baked beans, black beans, string beans, and all other beans, raw, dried, split, or parched; also codfish, skinned or unskinned, fresh, salted, or served in balls.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BAILEY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], I vote "yea."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). My colleague is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Sena-

tor from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY]. If present, my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to announce the pair of my colleague [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If present, my colleague would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	Pomerene
Bailey	Davis	McCumber	Reed
Bankhead	Dixon	Martin, Va.	Shively
Borah	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bristow	Foster	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brown	Gore	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Gronna	Newlands	Stone
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Swanson
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Taylor
Clapp	Johnston, Ala.	Owen	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Paynter	Watson
Crawford	Kern	Polindexter	Works

NAYS—30.

Bourne	Cullom	Lorimer	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Curtis	McLean	Smoot
Brandegee	Gamble	Nixon	Stephenson
Briggs	Guggenheim	Oliver	Townsend
Burnham	Heyburn	Page	Warren
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Richardson	
Crane	Lodge	Root	

NOT VOTING—12.

Culberson	Frye	Penrose	Sutherland
Dillingham	Gallinger	Percy	Tillman
du Pont	Lea	Rayner	Williams

So the bill was passed.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2983) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho will state it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Whether or not it is in order, the Senate having by unanimous consent determined upon the time when that measure shall be taken up, to change the order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks this does not change the order. The Senate has determined to take it up for final disposition at a particular time, but the Chair thinks that it can be taken up meantime for consideration, not for disposal.

Mr. HEYBURN. Frequently, when the question of fixing a time for a vote has been before the Senate, one of the reasons that has been urged is that Senators may safely be absent, if their business requires it, with the assurance that the measure will not come up. That has often had much to do with the reaching of unanimous-consent agreements. This is the first time I have ever known this departure from that rule. It has always been understood that when we fixed a time to take up a measure for final determination Senators might safely be absent. I have no objection to taking it up except that I do not like to see a departure from a good rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was understood at the time the order was entered that the then unfinished business should continue to be the unfinished business, and be considered just as this is being considered, and precisely as the bill which has just been passed was considered.

Mr. HEYBURN. Of course we can not vote upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly not.

Mr. PENROSE. It was also distinctly understood that amendments might be voted upon at any time up to the day fixed for the final disposition of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes; amendments in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will either himself or through some one else, if he is not here, lay this bill aside from time to time, in order that we may do other business. Of course, if anyone desires to debate the bill it ought to have the right of way. I recognize that. But I do not want the bill used for the purpose of preventing a vote upon some other measure in the meanwhile.

I make the suggestion to the Senator from Pennsylvania in order that we may have that understanding now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair suggest that it could not in any event do away with the morning hour, which is two hours?

Mr. CUMMINS. But we have met more than once a situation in which no one desired to debate the unfinished business, but rather than to lay it aside adjournment has been suggested, and that has accomplished delay in some very much needed legislation. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will have this in mind between now and the day we vote upon the reapportionment bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Of course, as far as I am concerned, I am not in charge of this particular bill. The unfinished business would be laid aside, I assume, at the request of a Senator, or the Senate can at any time drop the consideration of a measure and proceed to the consideration of any other bill. It is always in the hands of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like briefly to explain two amendments which I have introduced to the pending bill.

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator from Ohio goes on with that, I desire to ask attention to what the Senator from Pennsylvania said as to an alleged understanding. I understood—there was a good deal of noise, and I may not have understood it correctly—the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that while Thursday was set for the day for voting upon pending amendments, there was an understanding that that would not prevent in the meantime voting upon other amendments to the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. My understanding is, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow], I believe, expressly raised the point at the time, that amendments can be voted upon at any time, but not the bill.

Mr. BACON. I did not know that fact. Of course, if it is, the Senator is correct. But I want to make this suggestion—

Mr. PENROSE. And as a matter of fact, we have been voting on amendments right along every day.

Mr. BACON. I will not try to interfere with that understanding, but I want to make this suggestion: I understand the amendments which have been offered were not amendments really to the apportionment bill, but as to other matters which were sought to be engrafted upon it, to which I have no objection.

The apportionment bill itself, I think, is a matter of such importance that whenever amendments to it proper are to be voted upon there should be such notice to the Senate as would enable Senators to be present. It is a matter of such importance and reaches every nook and corner of the country to such an extent as, in my opinion, to make it proper that the Senate should be upon notice whenever there is going to be a vote upon an amendment to the bill proper. That is the only suggestion I would make in regard to it. So far as concerns the offering of other amendments which do not relate to the matter of apportionment, I have no objection to that at any time.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the request I made when the matter was up for consideration was that amendments might be offered in the intermediate days, so that there would not be a congestion on the day when the vote was to be taken, when debate could not be had, and one of the very purposes was to serve notice upon the Senate that amendments were likely to be voted upon any day, so that the Senate would not be practically abandoned on these intervening days.

Mr. BACON. I think the Senate will certainly recognize the fact that if the apportionment bill is to be amended without any regard to the final test voting, that is, if it can be done before that day, we will certainly have to have the Senate present all the time. These amendments are too important to be taken up informally when sometimes not more than a dozen Members of the Senate are present.

Mr. BRISTOW. I entirely agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. BURTON. I desire to state that I shall not at this time ask for a vote on my amendments. I should decidedly prefer that neither the vote upon them nor upon any other amendment should be taken until day after to-morrow, the day fixed by the unanimous-consent agreement. It is only fair to Members of the Senate that everyone should be here when the vote is taken. Again, it is not probable that there will be so many amendments proposed as to create any embarrassment. We can readily vote upon all of them on that day.

The first amendment to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate consists of the addition of a new section, to be known as section 5; on page 4, after line 19, to insert the following:

SEC. 5. That candidates for Representative or Representatives to be elected at large in any State shall be nominated in the same manner as candidates for governor, unless otherwise provided by the laws of such State.

The last section of the bill as reported—that is, section 4—contains this provision:

That in case of an increase in the number of Representatives in any State under this apportionment, such additional Representative or Representatives shall be elected by the State at large.

The bill as introduced and reported provides for choosing Representatives at large at the general election—that is, if a State has 21 Members under the old apportionment and 22 under the new bill or if the number of Members allotted to any State is increased and no reapportionment or redistricting is made by the State before the election of November, 1912, then such new Members shall be elected at large.

But I desire especially to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that while the election of additional Members apportioned to any State is provided for by this bill, yet in some States no machinery is provided for a nomination at large, and it is desirable that such a section should be added. I have examined the statutes of the State of Ohio and regard it as doubtful whether under the present laws of that State they could nominate a Congressman at large. The same is true of other States. This section is proposed to meet that contingency. It is to the effect that the Member of Congress shall be nominated in the same manner as the governor unless otherwise provided by law. After some consideration and consultation by correspondence with the attorneys general of a couple of the States interested, this seemed the simplest and the best provision to meet this situation.

I may desire to make some further remarks on this amendment to-morrow.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to his colleague?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I have not had time to examine the question, and I ask simply for information. In view of the provision of the Federal Constitution which provides that the legislature shall prescribe the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives, I should like the opinion of my colleague as to whether his proposed amendment would come within the power of Congress?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I think it would. The right to fix the times, places, and manner of elections rests with the individual States. Congress may make or alter such regulations. That provision of the Constitution would be especially salutary when a State has failed to make any provision. Nomination is a part of the election, an essential step in choosing a representative; and if the laws of any State should lack a provision governing nominations, it is certainly entirely proper for Congress to supply that omission. Indeed, it might alter the regulation of a State, although that question is not raised here.

I want to say further in this connection that this subject was considered at some length in the discussion of the so-called publicity bill. The Senate has passed a bill providing that requirements relating to filing statements of expenses shall apply to contests for nomination as well as to contests in the election proper. If we can pass a bill making the provision of the Constitution referred to applicable to the conduct and to the expenses of candidates for election to the House and Senate, we certainly can pass a law pertaining to nominations. Thus, so far as the action of the Senate is concerned, an affirmative decision upon this question was certainly reached in the enactment of the publicity bill. Independently of that, however, I think this is clearly within the power of Congress.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this provision is so desirable in order to avoid complications, that the probabilities are altogether against any opposition or question being raised. This is not a controverted subject where a statute might inure to the benefit of one party or the other. It would benefit both parties alike in providing for a situation where there might be serious embarrassment.

The other amendment which I have proposed requires perhaps a somewhat more extended explanation. It is this: On page 4, line 15, after the word "redistricted," strike out the words "by the legislature thereof in the manner herein prescribed," and insert in lieu thereof the words:

In the manner provided by the laws thereof and in accordance with the rules enumerated in section 3 of this act.

This amendment pertains to the dividing of the several States into districts and to the manner in which this shall be done. Section 3 contains this clause:

That in each State entitled under this apportionment to more than one Representative, the Representatives to the Sixty-third and each subsequent Congress shall be elected by districts composed of a contiguous and compact territory, and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants.

The next section—section 4—provides that Representatives "shall be elected from the districts now prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted by the legislatures thereof in the manner herein prescribed." "The manner herein prescribed" means that the district shall be composed of contiguous and compact territory and contain as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants, as expressed in the prior section.

I desire to call attention to the fact that as the bill passed the House in the preceding Congress it did not contain this clause or expression, "by the legislature thereof."

Mr. President, whatever our views may be on the subject of the initiative or referendum we can not ignore the existence of statutes in divers States of the Union under which they are the recognized methods of enacting laws. Under such circumstances what is the effect of this expression, "by the legislature thereof"? It is a distinct and unequivocal condemnation of any legislation by referendum or by initiative. It is a mandate to the States to this intent: Whatever your laws may be for the enactment of statutes, yet in the division of the State into congressional districts you must act by the legislature alone, even if under the laws a trivial question can be submitted to the whole electorate, nevertheless in this very important matter of dividing the State into districts the legislature alone shall have full authority.

At first sight, in reading this section and finding the words "by the legislature thereof," it would seem to be an oversight. Whether it is or not, I am unable to say; but in any event it does not belong here. A due respect to the rights, to the established methods, and to the laws of the respective States requires us to allow them to establish congressional districts in whatever way they may have provided by their constitution and by their statutes.

I call attention to the exceptional importance of a districting law. Mr. President, we all know there have been most unjust—yes, I may say, shameful—instances of gerrymanders in some of the States. In one State of the Union last autumn the candidates of one party for judge of the supreme court and several other State offices received a majority of 3,000 or 4,000. Nevertheless in that same State, at the same election, out of 16 Congressmen 13 were chosen by the other, or minority, party in the State.

If there is anything which is clearly a distinct denial of the rights of popular government it is a gerrymander. It is possible to so adjust a State by shoestring districts, by including in one district remote portions of the State and connecting them by a narrow line, as to absolutely defeat the will of the people. I can not understand how the Senate can refuse to adopt this amendment.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. SHIVELY. I agree with the Senator from Ohio in his view as to the iniquity of some of the gerrymanders. But in a general statement he might very easily be mistaken as to inferences to be drawn from the returns at an election. Take the instance of my own State. President Taft carried it in 1908, as I recall, by some 12,000 plurality, yet 11 out of the 13 Representatives were returned by the Democratic Party on an apportionment made by a Republican legislature.

On the face of the returns of an election you may conclude that there must have been a vile gerrymander. But, though our Republican friends had redistricted the State, and though the Republican candidate for President carried the State by 12,000, 11 out of the 13 districts returned Democrats.

I only say that local conditions in many States bring these things to pass. You can not always infer that they are the results of unfair apportionments.

Mr. BURTON. I concede to my friend from Indiana that under exceptional circumstances results of that kind may ensue. It is to be said that in the State of Indiana, in the election referred to, in 1908 a Democratic governor was elected and a Democratic legislature. I think I can call attention to another instance in Indiana which is even more striking than the one which the senior Senator from that State has mentioned.

Under a districting made by the Democrats in accordance with the census of 1890 there was a gross disproportion in the majorities in the respective districts. There were very large majorities under normal conditions in two or three districts which it was anticipated would go Republican, while in the others there was a small but apparently safe Democratic majority.

After 1892 and 1893 there was a nation-wide political reaction which extended to Indiana, and as a result in 1894 the Repub-

licans carried every district in the State, sending a solid delegation to Congress.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield further to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. SHIVELY. Does the Senator infer that the result of the election in 1894 was due to a redistricting act passed by the Indiana Legislature?

Mr. BURTON. The solid Republican delegation was due, in a measure, to a lack of calculation on the part of those who framed the districts. The majorities which were relied upon to carry them for the Democrats did not prove reliable; the rather narrow margins by which it was expected many districts would be carried were entirely wiped out.

Mr. SHIVELY. Of course, the Democracy of Indiana that year went down with the general tide. In the Nation we elected only 12 Representatives in Congress north of Mason and Dixon's line. That can hardly be attributed to a so-called gerrymander. If the Senator means that political parties are apt to overreach themselves when they make unfair apportionments I agree with him. But if he wants to infer that his own party is exempt from that abuse of power, I think he is utterly mistaken.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, I do not claim that. If I were to make any comparison I would say that your party had been guilty of a larger number of transgressions, but I will not say that my own party has been entirely free from considerations of party advantage.

Mr. SHIVELY. There the Senator is woefully mistaken.

Mr. BURTON. If the Senator desires to go into that subject, I can give him some figures on the question which I think will establish it, but I do not desire to do so at this time, though I may later discuss this from a partisan standpoint.

I can entirely agree with the Senator from Indiana in the statement that local conditions may affect an election to such an extent that we may not be sure that it was an unjust division which caused the returns to show exceptional results. But my argument goes far beyond that. It is not a question of chance illustrations; it is a matter of principle.

If you have a referendum in a State the object of which is to submit to the people at large the question of whether or no a statute shall stand, the question whether it is just or unjust, that provision ought especially to apply to a law dividing a State into districts, where there is such an opportunity for monstrous injustice. If there is any case in the whole list of laws where you should apply your referendum, it is to a districting bill.

Senators on the other side, and on this side as well, have of late addressed the Senate ardently advocating the principle of the referendum and the initiative. I shall be interested to know whether they will permit the restriction, "by the legislature thereof," to remain in this statute. If you believe in the principle, stand by the principle and do not take that very inconsistent and absurd position, "We are for the rule, but we are against the application thereof."

I take it the object sought by the amendment I have proposed could be secured by merely striking out the words "by the legislature thereof," but if it is to be amended I think it is desirable to make both the substituted and the following words more definite. So I have suggested that the Senate strike out the words "by the legislature thereof in the manner herein prescribed," and insert in lieu thereof, first, the words "in the manner provided by the laws thereof." This gives to each State full authority to employ in the creation of congressional districts its own laws and regulations. What objection can be made to a provision of that kind? Pass this amendment, and you will transmit to each State the message "Proceed and district your State in accordance with your laws." This act does not do that. It sends the message, "Do it in only one specified way; that is, by your legislature." Then I think—

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

Mr. BURTON. I will yield to the Senator from Indiana in just a moment. I think it best to add a few words more—"and in accordance with the rules enumerated by section 3 of this act." The rules enumerated in section 3 are, as already stated, that the districts shall be "composed of contiguous and compact territory, containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants."

Mr. President, there have been instances in which one district has contained two, or even three, times as many inhabitants as the adjoining district.

If we adopt as the basis of representation a population test, which is in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States, districts should be as nearly as possible equal in the number of their inhabitants. The courts in passing on

provisions like this, requiring contiguous and compact territory, and as nearly as possible an equal population, have been averse to any interference. It therefore seemed best to set forth in section 4 the language "in accordance with the rules enumerated in section 3 of this act," so as to bring home to each legislature or to the electorate of any State when they vote under the provisions of an initiative or referendum the requirement that the districts must be symmetrical in form, contiguous, compact, and that gross violations of law in the way of inequality of population should not be tolerated.

Now, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. I think otherwise I have said all that I care to at this time.

I wish to give notice, Mr. President, that I shall introduce other amendments before the vote is taken on the pending bill, and I may then desire to address the Senate at some length.

Mr. ROOT. I give notice of my intention to offer the following amendment, which I ask to have printed and laid on the table.

Mr. BURTON. In order to familiarize ourselves as nearly as possible with the question to be discussed, may I ask unanimous consent that the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York be read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York gives notice that at the proper time he will offer an amendment, which the Secretary will read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out from and including line 5 on page 1 to and including line 15 on page 3, and insert the following:

Three hundred and ninety-one Members, to be apportioned among the several States as follows: Alabama, 9; Arkansas, 7; California, 10; Colorado, 3; Connecticut, 5; Delaware, 1; Florida, 3; Georgia, 11; Idaho, 1; Illinois, 24; Indiana, 12; Iowa, 10; Kansas, 7; Kentucky, 10; Louisiana, 7; Maine, 3; Maryland, 6; Massachusetts, 14; Michigan, 12; Minnesota, 9; Mississippi, 8; Missouri, 14; Montana, 2; Nebraska, 5; Nevada, 1; New Hampshire, 2; New Jersey, 11; New York, 39; North Carolina, 9; North Dakota, 2; Ohio, 20; Oklahoma, 7; Oregon, 3; Pennsylvania, 33; Rhode Island, 2; South Carolina, 7; South Dakota, 2; Tennessee, 9; Texas, 17; Utah, 2; Vermont, 2; Virginia, 9; Washington, 5; West Virginia, 5; Wisconsin, 10; Wyoming, 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks that his amendment may lie on the table and be printed. Without objection, the order will be entered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, August 2, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 1, 1911.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Lawrence N. Houston, of Oklahoma, to be register of the land office at Guthrie, Okla., his term having expired February 11, 1911. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Hugh Scott, of Waukomis, Okla., to be receiver of public moneys at Guthrie, Okla., vice William B. Hodge, jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 1911.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR.

Henry M. Seeley to be supervising inspector, second district, Steamboat-Inspection Service.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

James H. Wilkerson to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Luman T. Hoy to be United States marshal, northern district of Illinois.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Frederick L. Chapin to be a captain.
Lieut. Commander Harley H. Christy to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander Jay H. Sypher to be a commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Glassford, jr., to be a lieutenant.
Surg. Manley F. Gates to be a medical inspector.
Asst. Surg. William Chambers to be a passed assistant surgeon.
Asst. Surg. Lee W. McGuire to be a passed assistant surgeon.

The following-named assistant naval constructors to be naval constructors:

Ross P. Schlabach, and
George S. Radford.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

August C. Wilhelm,
Hugh Allen,
Russell Willson,
Milo F. Draemel,
Pierre L. Wilson,
Stephen Doherty,
Garrett K. Davis,
Claude B. Mayo,
Herndon B. Kelly, and
James J. Manning.
Gardner L. Caskey,
John B. Rhodes,
Albert C. Read,
George H. Bowdey,
Robert A. Theobald,
Richard Hill,
Fletcher C. Starr,
William L. Beck,
Garret L. Schuyler,
Alfred W. Brown, jr.,
Frank Russell,
Guy E. Baker,
John A. Monroe,
William F. Newton,
David A. Scott,
Willis W. Bradley, jr.,
Miles A. Libbey,
Raymond A. Spruance,
Calvin P. Page,
Earle F. Johnson,
Henry K. Hewitt,
Felix X. Gygax,
Guy E. Davis,
Weyman P. Beehler,
Lemuel M. Stevens,
Joseph S. Evans,
Warren C. Nixon,
John W. W. Cumming,
Charles R. Clark,
Roy Le C. Stover,
Chester H. J. Keppler,
Charles A. Dunn,
John W. Lewis,
Frederick W. Milner,
Charles G. Davy,
Horace T. Dyer,
Charles C. Gill,
Rufus W. Mathewson,
Augustin T. Beauregard,
Damon E. Cummings,
Russell S. Crenshaw,
Warren G. Child,
Herbert S. Babbitt,
William H. Lee,
Bryson Bruce,
William P. Williamson,
Randall Jacobs,
Vaughn V. Woodward,
Richard S. Edwards,
Robert T. S. Lowell,
Clyde R. Robinson,
Richard T. Keiran,
Ralph C. Needham,
James B. Howell,
Willis W. Lawrence,
Charles C. Slayton,
Irving H. Mayfield,
John H. Hoover,
Louis H. Maxfield,
Raymond F. Frelsen,
William H. Walsh,
Alfred W. Atkins,
Philip H. Hammond,
Claud A. Jones,
Harry Campbell,
George W. Kenyon,
Allan S. Farquhar,
Lucien F. Kimball,
Harvey W. McCormack,
Harold M. Bemis,
Ernest D. McWhorter,

John M. Schelling, and
Bert B. Taylor.

Asst. Surg. George W. Shepard to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surgs. Ernest W. Brown and Alfred J. Toulon to be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surg. James T. Duhigg to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surg. Charles F. Sterne to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surgs. Sankey Bacon and Kent C. Melhorn to be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surg. Harry H. Lane to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surgs. David G. Allen and Chandler W. Smith to be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surg. Micajah Boland to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surgs. Joseph R. Phelps, George B. Crow, and Alfred L. Clifton to be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surg. Harry W. B. Turner to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surgs. Reginald B. Henry and Harry A. Giltner to be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surg. Lucius W. Johnson to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surgs. John B. Pollard, Arthur H. Dodge, George F. Cottle, and William L. Mann, jr., to be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surgs. Roy Cuthbertson, George B. Whitmore, John A. B. Sinclair, and Donald H. Noble to be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Naval Constructor Frank D. Hall to be a naval constructor.

Asst. Naval Constructors James L. Ackerson, Donald R. Battles, and Richard D. Gatewood to be naval constructors.

Boatswain Frank Bresnan to be a chief boatswain.

Boatswain Henry H. Richards to be a chief boatswain.

Machinist John I. Ballinger to be a chief machinist.

Machinist James H. McDonough to be a chief machinist.

Machinists George W. Byrne, Henry Lobitz, and Frank R. Barker to be chief machinists.

Carpenter Francis X. Maher to be a chief carpenter.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

J. H. Mason, Columbiana.

COLORADO.

George L. Coleman, Haxtum.

INDIANA.

John E. Clevenger, Parker.

George E. Murray, Rensselaer.

MISSOURI.

Patti B. McAdow, Lemar.

OKLAHOMA.

Carl Huffaker, Fairfax.

WASHINGTON.

Mary A. Ide, Granger.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Zephaniah J. Martin, Fairview (late Amos).

J. W. P. Saint Clair, Macdonald.

James P. Staton, Oak Hill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, August 1, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., delivered the following prayer:

O Thou great Jehovah, King of Kings and Lord of Lords, mighty to deliver, come Thou and reign in all our hearts that the work of this day may be acceptable in Thy sight and redound therefore to the good of the people here represented. And Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE WOOLEN SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11019, an act to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, for the consideration of the House. And I desire to state to the House that my purpose in doing so is to move to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11019, an act to reduce the tariff on wool and manufactures of wool.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Would it then require consideration in the Committee of the Whole or not? I am not sure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman that I think it will, and I would like to ask unanimous consent, if there is any consideration, that we may consider it in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and that it may be so considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to take the bill H. R. 11019 from the Speaker's table and consider it in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 11019. An act to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to disagree to the Senate amendment to H. R. 11019 and ask for a conference. I do not desire to go into a discussion of the question at this time.

Mr. MANN. Would not the Senate amendment have to be read?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Unless the gentleman from Illinois desires the amendment to be read as printed, I will ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of it. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Senate amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether anybody on our side desires time or not.

Mr. HILL. I would like about two minutes, perhaps five.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand, under the rules of the House, that when we consider a bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole it is under the five-minute rule, and the gentleman can be recognized for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is recognized for five minutes, and in the meantime the House will be in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I have seen this amendment. I take it that it does not vary much from the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin originally, which was voted down in the Senate. I understand it differs from that something like 5 per cent.

It is another illustration of the manner in which tariff bills are now being made, the ball being thrown by some Member and the legislative body hitting it if it can, making a home run if possible in one case, and going out at the bat in another case—without judgment, without reason, without intelligence, and without knowledge.

Now, so far as the original Underwood woolen bill is concerned, I think the woolen industry of the United States would just as soon have one bill as the other; just exactly. They are equally destructive. It is only a question whether the industry shall be killed by a bullet or stabbed to death. That is all there is to it. The Wilson bill gave free wool and 50 per cent duty on woolen cloth such as is used for men's and women's dress goods. That is the largest item of importation. The Underwood bill gives a duty of 20 per cent on wool and 40 per cent on cloth, leaving a net duty of 27 per cent on manufactured woolen fabrics. That is 23 per cent ad valorem less than the Wilson bill, which closed most of the factories in the United States. My understanding of the La Follette bill, which is now offered as an amendment, is that it is substantially the same in its ultimate effect. I figured it up the other day in another place when it was being acted upon, and found that, instead of 23 per cent less than the Wilson bill, it was 17½ per cent less than the Wilson bill, so that you see either bill is absolutely destructive to the woolen industry.

I suppose one of these propositions is to be passed by Congress, and I suppose the cotton bill, which is equally destructive to the cotton industry, will be passed also. I am very glad to see the Members from the South taking a little of their own medicine, and I hope that all this talk which is going on now around the Capitol to the effect that it is not the intention of the Democratic Party to force to an ultimate conclusion the cotton bill may, for its own credit, be mere rumors, because I can conceive

of no greater political advantage that could come to the Republican Party than to have the free-list bill passed and to have the wool bill passed, but to have the cotton bill held up. And if that is done, gentlemen, if that is done, you will not be here after the next election. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It must all go together, and, as I say, there being practically no difference between the La Follette bill and the Underwood bill, so far as the woolen industry is concerned, I rise simply to call attention to the fact that both are destructive to the woolen industry of the United States—

Mr. KITCHIN. And to the Republican Party.

Mr. HILL. We will take our chances on that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me just one word? I want to add my profound conviction that the revision of some of the rates of the cotton schedule, notwithstanding all the articles from muckraking magazines in the past two years, is as desirable as the revision of the rates in the woolen schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut speaks of rumors going about the Capitol. I do not believe that any man can justly say that the Representatives on this side of the House have hesitated for one moment to revise the schedules that affect their own people any more than they have hesitated in revising the schedules that affect other people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. HILL. I want to compliment here and now the chairman of the committee for his honesty of purpose and the straightforward way in which he has conducted his business since this session began. [Applause.] I believe that he honestly believes in a tariff for revenue only and is doing the best he can to carry it out, but he must admit that the rumors are going around the Capitol in regard to what is intended to be done concerning the cotton schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for the kindly words he has said in reference to myself. We can not answer rumors, but I can assure the gentleman that if any of these bills go to the President of the United States, and he signs them, that we will finish the work at this session of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the President of the United States refuses to let us legislate, then we will prepare our additional bills during the summer vacation and present them at an early date in the winter session of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, as to the cotton bill, we intend to push that bill so far as we are concerned as vigorously as we intend to push the woolen bill. We are going to vote on it as soon as we can this week. As to whether it will pass the Senate before the adjournment of Congress will depend on the action of a Republican Senate and the action of a Republican President and not upon our action on this side of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. MANN. We are all interested in knowing somebody's estimate as to how long we shall stay here, and the estimate of the gentleman from Alabama is certainly more valuable than the estimate of anybody else. The gentleman gives us information in reference to the continuation of the session if the President does not veto a bill, and an early adjournment if he does. What I want to ascertain from the gentleman is an estimate as to the continuation of the session if the bills do not get to the President. Are the working lines now between the gentlemen on that side of the aisle and their fellow Democrats at the other end of the Capitol, and certain other gentlemen, in such a condition that this bill is likely to get to the President?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not answer the gentleman's question at this time. As to the working lines, I will say to the gentleman that that has not been as yet perfected. [Laughter.] But I have hopes that it will be, and that we can present the bill to the President.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman a moment ago talked as though it was certain that the bill would go to the President, and the natural inference from that is that the gentleman is prepared to yield to the working lines at the other end of the Capitol in order that the bill may go to the President. We are all interested in knowing whether it is the House that has something to say about tariff legislation, or whether we act pro forma in order that the Senate may actually pass a tariff bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We found that out in the last Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend that I will take pleasure in answering his question when the conference report

on the bill comes back to the House. As to what my friend from Connecticut said about these being drastic bills, I want to say, in the first place, that my friend is entirely mistaken about the incidental protection under the original bill that passed the House being only 27 per cent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended five minutes? Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the incidental protection that grows out of this wool bill to the woolen manufacturer certainly, in my judgment, amounts to 30 per cent, and in my judgment there is no question but that with that amount of incidental protection to the woolen industry it should make it a thriving and successful business in this country.

As I stated the other day in reference to the cotton bill, I believe that that bill, although there is a greater reduction in rate than in the woolen bill, I believe it is the most conservative bill so far as its effect on the industry will be, because, as I said the other day, our estimate of increased importations is only \$10,700,000, less than one-half of 1 per cent of the amount of cotton goods consumed in this country, and one-half of 1 per cent increased importation could not possibly injure the great cotton industry in this country.

But if we are mistaken in our estimate of the importation, and it is twice as much as we estimate, then the increased importation and increased competition will only amount to 1 per cent more by reason of the passage of this bill; and when we have got a great cotton industry that is exporting its goods to the Orient and which increased its exportations last year, I say it is utter folly for any man to claim that a bill that only increases the importation less than one-half of 1 per cent is a serious menace to any business industry in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like the privilege of five minutes more in which to reply to the gentleman from Alabama. His time was extended for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says that the incidental protection under the Underwood woolen bill is 30 per cent. There is no incidental protection on any rate of duty less than the difference in the cost of production, because such competition is unequal and unfair, and if it was 5 per cent less than the difference in the cost of production the revenue tariff would not carry that incidental protection, because the industry would be impossible. But the gentleman makes this serious mistake when he says there is 30 per cent protection under his bill, for he is only counting withdrawing from the rate of duty on the fabric the compensatory rate on the wool, whereas he makes no provision whatever for the duty which the manufacturer has to pay on all the other materials aside from wool that enter into the cost of the fabric. Now, Canada tried it at 27½ per cent preferential tariff with Great Britain and absolutely failed, as we failed under the Wilson bill. Canada had to raise her duty from 27½ per cent to 30 per cent, with free wool, with a very much lower duty on everything entering into the production of wool and fabrics, and to-day the industry in Canada is practically nil, for I am informed by those who know that at least half of the woolen mills of Canada are idle, even under a 30 per cent preferential duty with Great Britain and very much lower duties on everything else that enters into the fabric.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Connecticut if a large number of woolen mills in this country to-day under a 90 per cent tariff are not idle?

Mr. HILL. They are, and cotton mills, too; and they will continue to be idle just so long as the shadow of a Democratic tariff for revenue only hangs over them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, in justification of my statement in regard to rumors concerning the cotton industry I submit for printing in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning upon the South's influence in Congress and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I will not ask to have it read at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

SOUTH'S INFLUENCE IN CONGRESS.

The attitude of the delegations from the cotton States on the tariff question is challenged by the Manufacturers' Record, which has superior facilities for sounding the business sentiment of that section. According to the Record, the South has grown away from its politicians, and they no longer respond to the spirit of the times. The South has changed from a wholly agricultural community to one whose factories have a productive capacity greater than the combined output of the farms and mines, but some of the politicians have not changed with it. They cling to the South of tradition, and while they are essentially honest the attitude of some of them in tariff legislation and discussion gives evidence that they must arouse themselves and learn if they would be of value to their section.

This severe arraignment of the statesmen of the South by a usually well-informed and conservative southern publication is impressive, but really it is not altogether deserved. The work of the extra session in the House, if fairly indicative of the statesmanlike qualities of these men, does not show that they are proceeding regardless of the interests of their section. Search the legislative record in vain for a single instance where the South has not been excepted from the ruinous workings of cut tariff rates. Scan the farmers' free-list bill, if you will, for one among the hundred articles of manufacture affected that is made to any extent in the South. Just how the southerners hypnotized their party colleagues from the North into voting for that monumental piece of sectional discrimination has never been explained. The wool revision hits Texas growers; but can not the South make a small sacrifice, seeing that the blow falls elsewhere with hundredfold force?

Now comes the cotton schedule, which on its face has the aspect of a square deal at last. But really how much does the coarse cotton-goods business of the South suffer in comparison with the handicap the bill puts on the North? Is it not worth while to hand New England a lemon of such acidity, even though it does do some hurt to northern capital doing business in the South?

And doubtless the remaining schedules will be taken care of with the same religious fidelity to detail that has marked the policy of revision up to date. The RECORD, we apprehend, has taken its cue from the public utterances of the men it pillories, whereas a truer appreciation of their services might have been gained by a study of their work in the privacy of the Committee on Ways and Means and the caucus room.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat I would like to ask him if all of the Democrats in the United States were dead whether all of these mills that are now standing idle would at once start up? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I yielded to answer reasonable questions. I will state that I think as it goes on there will be less and less Democrats living, but I expect there will always be some—just such as the gentleman who asks the question.

Mr. BARNHART. It does not look that way now.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Speaker, the last consular report from Barcelona sets forth an extraordinary depression in the cotton manufacturing business in that city. Is the Democratic Party responsible for that?

Mr. HILL. I have not read that report yet; but I shall read it, and be prepared to answer the question when I have.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Chair announced the following conferees:

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. RANDELL of Texas, Mr. HARRISON of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DALZELL.

CAMPAIGN PUBLICITY BILL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2958) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will state his purpose in asking this disagreement? I will ask him first if he will agree to couple with his motion this: That in the adjustment of the differences between the two Houses on the said bill the House conferees shall yield to the Senate conferees so far as to agree that the following three propositions shall be retained in the bill:

1. That there shall be the same publicity of contributions and expenditures concerning primary elections and indorsements at general elections as in the case of general elections.

2. That the same publicity shall be required of contributions and disbursements for the nomination, indorsement, or election of Senators as in the case of Representatives in Congress.

3. That there shall be a limitation upon the amount which may be expended to secure the nomination, indorsement, or election as Senator or Representative in Congress.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], I will say to him frankly I will not couple the motion he has just read with the motion I have made to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. I do not believe that the conferees ought to be instructed by the House, in the first instance, because I fear an instruction would have a tendency to destroy a free conference between the two bodies and might be objectionable to the Senate. Let me say to the gentleman, however, that he may rest in perfect contentment. If the motion which I have made prevails, I think I am warranted in saying the gentleman will be one of the conferees. I will never yield one iota from every suggestion contained in the paper which you have just read sooner than you do, and if you yield, then I assure you I will still be found fighting for those principles, every one of them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asks the purpose of my motion. I want to say to the House very briefly and frankly that I regard the amendments added to this bill by the Senate as very valuable additions to it. I have, however, after carefully studying the amendments, discovered what I think are obvious errors and obvious mistakes, matters that I believe ought to be reformed and perfected during this session of Congress in order that the bill, when it is enacted, may be such that no one who advocates the principle of publicity will be ashamed to go to his constituents and confess that he helped make it. My only purpose is to perfect the bill. I disclaim any purpose whatever to detract in the least from it. I do not want to destroy it, but I want to inject into it life, vigor, and efficiency, and nothing more, and I have every reason to believe that with the gentleman's able assistance as a conferee we will have no trouble whatever in reporting such a bill to this House that every Member who favors publicity will readily agree to the conference report, which, I assure the House, will retain the primary feature. That is one of my hobbies, I will say to the gentleman. I think this answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, if I may have a few minutes, four or five minutes?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, the last Democratic convention adopted as part of its platform a plank demanding greater publicity for election expenses. A bill was brought in here in this Democratic House which improved very little, if any, the bill passed by the Republican Party at the last session of Congress. It did have in it a provision requiring the publicity of expenses before the election. My friend from Missouri says that his hobby is requiring publicity of primary election expenses, but it is to be observed that he voted against his hobby when such a proposition was offered upon the floor as an original amendment to this bill. The Senate has put in certain amendments which embody that feature and the others to which I have already called attention, and which we on this side think are very important features. Now, we did not know just what we were going to face this morning. A week ago the gentleman from Missouri informed us while the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was speaking that if he lived until to-morrow he would have an opportunity to vote to concur in the Senate amendments, but last night our Democratic friends held a secret caucus upon this subject. I find in the Washington Herald of this morning this statement:

More than 150 Democrats attended the caucus last night until 12.30 a. m. in the Hall of the House of Representatives, which was called to decide upon the policy of the majority party of the body with reference to the Senate amendments to the campaign publicity bill.

Right off the bat the caucus adopted a stringent resolution forbidding any Member to reveal anything that might happen during the continuance of the caucus, and threatening the instant discharge of any employee discovered giving out information on the subject.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

In other words, they were opposed to publicity of their own actions on the publicity bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Therefore I say we did not know what we might be up against this morning. Now, I am free to confess that the Senate amendments—and I would rather see them adopted in toto than see them fail—do need some improvement, some smoothing out. For instance, there is a provision in one of them that no candidate shall expend in the aggregate more than 10 cents for each voter in his district.

Now, a voter is a man who votes. Differently construed he might be a man who is entitled to vote, but no man on earth

can tell before election who is going to vote, how many are going to vote, or how many are entitled to vote. Therefore that provision in the bill as it now stands is inoperative. Nobody could be convicted for a violation of that provision. If you took it in the State of Mississippi, say, in the first three districts, the votes at the last congressional election were so few they have failed to record them at all in the Congressional Directory, I take it, therefore, that candidates in those districts could not spend anything. In the sixth district there were cast 4,070 votes. A man could spend \$407 there. I notice that my friend from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has left that entirely out of his proposed amendment, which he printed in the RECORD the other day. I hoped the gentleman from Missouri would consent to instructions to conferees such as I suggested. I do not think such instructions would prevent a full and free conference, because they do not ask that the Senate conferees yield to the House conferees in any particular, but merely that the House accept.

But I have entire confidence in the gentleman from Missouri and in his statement. If he and I are conferees, as he suggests, and he votes in harmony with my suggestions, as he says he will, we shall finally have a pretty good bill. I take it that he will be the chairman of the conferees of the House; at least, the first member on the conference. I am willing to accept his statement. As some of the Senate amendments were made on the floor of the Senate, some of them without previous consideration, they can be improved, and therefore I am entirely content, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, that the motion of the gentleman from Missouri shall prevail.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, permit me just one moment more to make an additional statement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] read from some newspaper an article concerning the caucus of the Democrats last night. In some respects, I take it, although I could not hear the reading very well, the article recites facts and in some respects it does not recite facts.

Mr. MANN. Tell us what the facts are.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Come over on this side and get acquainted. I will say, Mr. Chairman, there was no action taken in caucus that binds anybody to vote for this measure or against it when it comes back from conference—none whatever. When it comes back it is going to be so harmonious and so perfectly in accord with public sentiment that I think everybody, without caucus action, will be for it. I hope so, at least.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees:

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri, Mr. CONRY, and Mr. OLMSTED.

THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12812, a bill to reduce the duties on manufactures of cotton.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12812, with Mr. CULLOP in the chair.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I had promised to yield the first hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] this morning, but he has yielded half of his time to his colleague [Mr. WILDER]. Therefore, I yield 30 minutes to the latter.

Mr. WILDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the distinguished statesman from Massachusetts, my friend and colleague [Mr. McCALL], for the privilege of speaking first this morning. I trust what I have to say may not be entirely unworthy of the favor.

I shall speak upon this bill from the standpoint of the business man or from the standpoint of its practical workings. I am quite aware that laws must be made by lawyers. No less true is it that business must be transacted by business men. About one-half of my life I have given to the rank and file; a large portion of the other half I have given to manufacturing, incidentally knowing something about the law. I have found, however, by experience that the lawyer knows about as much concerning the practical workings of the business man as the business man knows about the intricacies of the law. Each has a general knowledge of the other, but the science of business is an exact science, while the workings of law are not exact.

This we understand well by the various important decisions that are rendered from time to time. As to the last two decisions from the United States Supreme Court, none knew what they were to be, whereas when we come to the affairs of business, it is an exact science. The business that is legitimate, that is well managed, will succeed. The business that is not well managed will fail.

And so as to the tariff. I wish to speak upon it from the standpoint of the business with which it has to do. Certainly it is the largest problem connected with our business affairs. We well know the line of business activity from the man who handles his own farm and raises his own crops from which he takes his living, then to the transactions that he has with his neighbor and the market and next to his town, and next his State; then with his nation, each of which is larger and more complex than before. Still, when we come to the question of our business activities with the world, we are in the realm of the largest business transactions that exist.

The tariff, to my mind, seems something like a tree, with one common root and many branches. Perhaps all of our national activities would center in this same common root. The tariff divides itself, as we hear it spoken of very many times, into five different lines of activities—free trade, tariff for revenue, protection, regulation, and reciprocity. They are all related, and when we come to organize a tariff on the basis of any one of them, we overlook others just as important and perhaps more so than the one we consider. For instance, when we come to advance the idea of tariff along the lines of revenue only, we leave out other more important features than the element of revenue. Free trade, surely from a Democratic standpoint, is nothing. I say "nothing" because if we had no laws whatever, that would be free trade. We need no law to trade freely. Then we come to a tariff for revenue only. A tariff for revenue only is wholly mercenary when considered alone, and it may be cruel. For instance, 45 per cent tariff on women and children's clothing, provided in the Underwood wool bill when considered alone, is cruel, but when it has involved with it the question whether or not it insures additional work for those very people, you have brought in another element which may rescue it from its discreditable position as a tariff for revenue only. One can not be used wisely alone. They all ought to be operated together. And when we come to revise the cotton schedule for revenue purposes, we leave out matters of more importance for those of less importance; we leave out those more honorable for those of less credit, for certainly to live alone for money, as an individual, is not the highest ideal of life. Most certainly such can not be the fact with a country so great as ours.

I wish, then, to go a little further than I went in a previous speech made in this House on the question of labor and its relation to the tariff. I said then that the goods that we used from abroad or imported, or the question of tariff regulation, was from 50 to 75 per cent labor. I wish to increase that ratio to from 75 to 90 per cent labor. I will try and make that clear if I have time. The reason I say this is a question of labor is for the same reason that Abraham Lincoln advanced when he was speaking about one of the great questions of the day in his time, that "the evil so far transcends the good that I shall speak of it only as an evil."

So I say that in our matters of tariff and our matters of manufacture the question of labor so far exceeds all other things that I am constrained to say that it is almost wholly a question of labor. It is more than 75 per cent a question of labor, and I wish to address myself to the subject from that standpoint.

I wish, then, to state that the vital test of a correctly regulated tariff, from the standpoint of our business interests, as a whole, is the question of the balance of trade. I make the statement that the times of the greatest depression in this country have been the times when the balance of trade stood most largely against us for a considerable period and that the times of the greatest prosperity in this country were those times when the balance of trade was most largely in our favor for a considerable period.

It is exactly the same as in our individual affairs. If my outgoes are greater than my incomes, it is not long before I am in bad shape financially. If, on the other hand, my income is greater than my outgo, I am constantly improving financially. If we sell abroad more than we buy from abroad, we are increasing our foreign balance and our prosperity; and it makes no difference how much we may argue, or how far we go hither or yon, we can not get away from this proposition. It starts with our individual affairs and goes through every business avenue of life, and it assuredly does not cease in our national affairs. The real or practical test is the size of the imports. For every million dollars worth of goods we buy from abroad,

that we can make here, we put out of employment more than \$750,000 worth of labor in this country. This may be worked out from any standpoint from which you may approach it, and the net result must be the same.

Many times the question is overlooked of the great relation that our tariff affairs have to the question of finance. Here comes up a very important matter that I do not often see mentioned, and that is the relation of our tariff affairs to panics. Many people do not appear to observe a material difference between the panic of 1907 and the panic of 1892-3. The panic of 1892-3 was a chronic panic, the panic of 1907 was an acute panic. One came about when there were normal adequate cumulative reasons for it. The panic of 1907 came about when there was no normal or cumulative reason for it. What was the difference? In 1892-3 and previous and succeeding we were buying goods largely from abroad and our mills at home were shut down or abnormally so. Our debts were growing largely abroad, and our income from abroad was slight, until the trade balance was against us, and consequently the financial balance was against us, and the foundation was laid for those distressing times which I know something about, from 1892 to 1897. That was a chronic panic followed as always by a depression brought about by the balance of trade running largely against us, or in other words by our imports being large and our exports being small; by our buying more abroad than we sold abroad.

The causes of this depression are not far to find. They have been analyzed so many times in this House that it is not necessary for me to analyze them again. In the cotton schedule before us, however, the average tariff levied is substantially less than it was in the law that made those awful times possible or induced such a disastrous culmination.

In the fall of 1907 the panic we had was acute. There was no normal, adequate, or cumulative reason for it. A combination of sharp, quick circumstances brought about a state of affairs acute and severe at the time, yet from which we quickly recovered, because the foundation elements were not such as would make a long depression inevitable. Those elements were the long-continued large balance of trade in our favor; that is, our large exports and our comparatively smaller imports. We gain or lose gold or credits from abroad exactly in proportion to our trade balances, and it does not follow that because this country is large it can not be harmed, nor does it follow because it can not be harmed in a moment that it can not be harmed at all. Of course, as we grow larger we may take in more millions of foreign goods and not notice it to any large extent, as we might when we were smaller.

I suppose as the country grows large and wealthy to that extent we may take in foreign goods; but still the law stands, that every million dollars' worth of foreign goods imported throws out \$750,000 worth of American labor. We can not get away from that proposition. We may not be able to find at first the people who are out of work, because it does not put out of work specific individuals. But it does, just the same, put out of work that amount of labor—not necessarily all in one factory, but distributed all along the line. Our affairs are becoming so stupendous and so inextricably interwoven that it is difficult to state just where the ultimate comes, but that it comes is something that must be admitted. The mere statement of the fact makes it apparent that there can be no wage scale for us in goods coming into this country from abroad. Any wage scale, however poor, is better than no wage scale at all.

Many times it is stated that the free-trade bills, or those bills lowering duties, like the cotton schedule and the wool schedule and others, are like or similar to the trade relations we have had, like reciprocity with Cuba and like free trade with the Philippines or some other bills of that sort. Is there no difference between our trade relations that we are now making with Canada, with 8,000,000 people, the nearest like ourselves of any people on the face of the earth, and such an arrangement as the free-list bill that deals with the peoples of all the earth with its 1,000,000,000 inhabitants? Is there no difference in the exchange of some or even all supplies with Canada on an even basis and the proposition to give up our markets regardless to the pauper labor of the earth? They can not be compared. I get out of patience sometimes at these calamity howlers about the harm that will come from reciprocity with Canada and Cuba and yet are in favor of the farmers' free-list bill that gives our markets to all the world when they do not give us anything in exchange, whereas reciprocity is an exchanging of products, like reciprocity with Canada, in which she gives us some of her products and we give her some of ours in return on some fair basis. If Canada was commercially annexed to our country, is there anyone who thinks that that would materially

harm us—8,000,000 people like our own, merely adding another State like New York or Pennsylvania? It might be glorious, but scarcely calamitous. It is wholly unlike the question relating to other bills, one of which we are considering at the present time. Hundreds and thousands of people are molested by one and not harmed by the other.

I again refer to those beautiful times between 1892 and 1897, the only time when we have had a Democratic tariff law since I remember, for I have heard it stated in this House several times that President Taft remarked that Schedule K of the Payne tariff bill is indefensible. Quite likely that is true, but where was it ever written that he stated that the Underwood bill was defensible? Where has he ever stated that the Underwood revision of the cotton schedule now before us was defensible? Give him a chance at them and see what he will say about them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Again, when you are quoting Presidents, why not quote your own President? What did he say about the Wilson-Gorman bill? He did not take out one schedule that he thought was indefensible. Did not he say that the bill was a piece of party perfidy and dishonor? Why not quote this for a change? But the late President Cleveland, you must remember, was half Republican; that is why he was elected. [Laughter.] You say, Wherein? I say on the matter of finance one of the greatest and most important of all our affairs. I may have more to say on this subject when it comes up in the winter. Was not he squarely on the Republican platform on finance? I say that no man can ever be elected President of this great Republic who is an out and out Democrat; and, gentlemen, if you want to elect a President a year from next fall you must be sure and take one that is partly Republican. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

That celebrated Wilson law of 1893 to 1897, we are informed by competent authority, carried an average tariff of 44 per cent ad valorem on the cotton schedule. The Payne law, which is now in vogue, we are informed carries an average of 48 per cent on the cotton schedule. The present bill that we have before us, we are informed by the same authority, carries an average of 27 per cent on the cotton schedule. By what token or rule was it ever established that in the Democratic experience we had from 1893 to 1897 under a 44 per cent average tariff on a cotton schedule that we can now live with an average of 27 per cent?

The Wilson bill is out-Wilsoned in this affair. It is also stated by the same source that the estimated imports under this proposed bill will be something like \$11,000,000 more than under the present law. It has been stated this morning that this was a very small amount of the whole—that is, of our entire cotton commerce. Granted. Just the same, from the time we start, all along through the line of these manufactures not only the labor in the yarn and weaving mill, but the labor of building the factories, machinery, and the administration, and overhead charges, the selling expenses, and the railroad employees, and every other affair that enters into or is connected with the handling of the goods, all goes into the question of labor, it can be very easily established that at least \$8,000,000 of labor is represented by \$11,000,000 of imports. Now, it is thought to be a light thing, \$11,000,000 increase in our imports, but it is admitted that such is the expectation, and if such is the realization it is easy to discover that about \$8,000,000 of labor would be put out of work annually, allowing \$500 each, then 16,000 people will be thrown out of work by these increased imports. This bill is wrongly labeled. This bill ought to be labeled a bill to throw 16,000 people out of work, because that is exactly what is admitted that it will do. How can we escape from the proposition that where goods come in from abroad they carry with them no labor, and so all is lost.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WILDER. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is figuring on labor at \$500 a year.

Mr. WILDER. In the cotton mills, men, women, and some children.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that the reports from the Department of Commerce and Labor give it at less than \$5 a week as the average, and will that make \$500 a year?

Mr. WILDER. I do not object in the least to my Democratic friend arguing for me. I wanted to be fair, and I put it at \$500. If he wants to put it at \$5 a week, then he must throw 32,000 people out of work. I like it if he does.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to get the right information, and if the gentleman wants to sustain a tariff and claim that it has succeeded and accomplished something while it is getting that

kind of conditions for labor, he is welcome to the credit for doing it.

Mr. WILDER. I would only make one point in reply to that. The labor even then is better than no labor at all, as they had from 1893 to 1897, with Gen. Coxey and his army and soup houses galore. Does the gentleman want some more of that? This bill looks like an effort in that direction.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILDER. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman think with 40 per cent of children under the age of 16 at work, where labor is crushing the lives out of the children at a tender age, and also out of women, that that is a condition that is acceptable in preference to hardly anything?

Mr. WILDER. I am not arguing for that. I am not in favor of women and children operating in our factories. I would like to see them all up to this \$500 basis, to which the gentleman from Illinois appears to object. I am certainly making this proposition fair for his side.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I was just asking for the facts. I wanted to know whether my information is correct or not.

Mr. WILDER. I will not raise the question of whether or not it is. I shall contend, however, that even if true in some cases and under some circumstances, that a small wage is better than no wage and Government soup.

Mr. BUCHANAN. My efforts have always been for high wages, and if I can do anything to get them, I will be glad to do it.

Mr. WILDER. Then, the gentleman will have to vote against this bill. Mr. Chairman, I wish to follow a little further the question of cheap wages raised by the gentleman from Illinois. I stated before that I had spent nearly half of my life in manufacturing. No tariff is necessary, let me say in the first place, to protect anything in any of the factories with which I am connected. We are a peculiar set of American ducks out our way, and we believe very strictly in Americanism. We welcome all of these people who come to us from the other side, a million of them a year, and are willing to do all we can to help them be Americans, in the real sense, whether born here or adopted here; but when it comes to a question of relative wages, these affairs adjust themselves, and when we come to a thoroughly expert American proposition, whether it be in manufacturing or anything else, the world can not compete with us.

When many of these cheap wage people come over from Europe, Asia, and Africa, they are not in any sense Americans, and those who don't want to be, or don't try to be, as with the Chinese, we don't want them here, for this is America, the "land of the free and the home of the brave." Many insist on their Old World methods and living and don't get into the spirit at all, or only in a small way. We believe in "American wages for American workmen," and would frame our tariff bills accordingly. Witness the splendid prosperity of the last 10 years. The world never knew the like of it regardless of all its human shortcomings. But it takes time to become a true American. It is not easy perhaps to come to Congress through the bridge-building-blacksmith-steeple-jack route, especially when you have to escape from perilous positions via the hand-over-hand cable route à la the Apostle Paul from the Damascus wall, but like Booker Washington's remark about the negro, we are coming up, some head first, some heels first, some end over end, but we are coming up.

And there are many similar experiences in this country, also many lines of manufacture so developed that the old country simply can not compete. It has been stated, however, and misused in my estimation to some extent in the shoe industry where one party stated that the tariff was not material with his particular business and some have tried to use it as meaning that it was not material in the shoe business generally. Nothing of the sort. The facts are this party makes a specialty by which he has built up a trade along special lines and people call for that thing and want nothing else and the question of competition is not in it, but when you come to the cotton, or worsted, or woolen schedules the mills abroad are as well equipped as our mills here and the labor as skilled and perhaps more so. Those are old industries built up from time immemorial. Now, the real question after all is said and done is, Do we want American wages paid to American workmen? We may say they are miserable in some cases; that is, those paid near-Americans and far-Americans. We hope they will all become more Americanized later.

We are aware that the prices in many of these cases are too low, but wherein will it remedy matters to make them still lower; wherein will it help to buy the goods abroad and shut down the mills altogether? Will we pursue our course along

those lines? Do those who are in favor of this bill and think that American wages are not high enough at the present time think matters will be benefited by taking labor away altogether and giving it to them on the other side of the river. It occurs to me that is rather an unfortunate method with which to accomplish anything good. I should think it was going down hill backward. Now I want to put up one point in regard to the awful profits which manufacturers make on their goods. I judge that some speakers are not entirely informed along these lines, and I want to make an illustration to show what is apparent on its face and ask if on the whole it looks like an enormous profit, and yet it is what often happens when you find these large profits from the big concerns or maybe trusts. Suppose the concern has a capital of \$100,000, is in good credit, as any quantity of our large concerns are, and can borrow \$100,000 more. They would not pay exceeding 5 per cent for that additional \$100,000.

Mr. BOWMAN. They would now pay 6 per cent.

Mr. WILDER. An average of 5 per cent for a concern in good credit. I do not mean all over the country, but I mean where our large manufacturing industries are, but I do not wish even to be confined to 5 per cent. You can take 6 per cent, it makes no difference. So they have a working capital of \$200,000, and with that working capital of \$200,000 there are many mills in this country which do \$1,000,000 worth of business. Now would any of you think that 5 per cent profit was too much after the labor and the materials are paid for, after the overhead is paid for, selling expenses paid for, salaries are paid for; would you think that 5 per cent was too large a net profit? I do not believe anyone here would for a moment suggest that they were not willing to pay a profit of 5 per cent on goods they purchase; but are you aware that under such circumstances the net profit of that concern would be \$44,000 a year on \$100,000 capital? These big concerns and trusts of which we speak at the present time are doing an enormous business, with a profit so small you can hardly find it specifically. I am going to give some little details of what the margin is and—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 15 minutes additional time to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes additional.

Mr. WILDER. I propose to show on some goods I have here made in the fourth Massachusetts district, which I know about, that I am sure you will not find any fault with the profits that are made on them, and at the same time I do not know how we can cut them out of it, because when we cut out much we cut out the whole. I do not think anyone questions the proposition which I stated in reference to \$100,000 capital and \$100,000 borrowed capital doing \$1,000,000 worth of business and earning honorably and fairly \$44,000. I do not say that all of the concerns in the country are doing that. But, if you apply this principle to the much-hated Standard Oil Co., and no one has any reason to hate them more than I, and yet, I suppose, even the devil is entitled to his due. And you come to figure up the business this concern does, I doubt if the profit will exceed 10 per cent, perhaps not more than 5. They are located in every hamlet, everywhere. They make a little rake-off here and there and everywhere, but the total amounts to \$40,000,000 dividends. I am aware of it. I want it distinctly understood that I am not talking for that crowd, and yet the late Henry H. Rogers once made the statement that there never was a time when water could be hauled 100 miles and sold cheaper than oil is sold for to-day. Poland water, just pure spring water, comes from Poland, Me., and we pay 25 cents or more per quart, which would be a dollar or more a gallon, while kerosene sells for 16 cents a gallon.

I do not wish to defend these people, but it is generally admitted to be the best-managed concern that there is on earth to-day, and upon that fact depends much of the profit. They have been ripped up the back and the front for being a trust and have been dissolved by the United States Supreme Court. Now let us see what we have gained or if the price of their goods is any cheaper. These fellows know how to manage their affairs profitably under any circumstances. But here is another concern that makes a profit of only 7½ per cent on fabrics. If any of you object to that profit, hold up your hands. I am talking about these things because a reduction of 7½ per cent will wipe out all there is. A reduction of 10 per cent will ruin any quantity of industries in this country. When we talk of these things in a flippant fashion we do not know what we are talking about. We are talking theory and not fact.

I have here some gingham made by the big Parkhill mills, of Fitchburg, Mass., possibly some of them by the big Lancaster mills, of Clinton, Mass. I have also here two pieces of worsted. The same story in regard to both of them. This piece of worsted [exhibiting] is not exactly like the worsted which I have on, but those near by me can see that there is not much difference between them. It can be bought for \$1.50 a yard. It takes 3½ yards to make a suit of clothes, making the total cost of enough for a suit \$5.25. That piece of worsted [exhibiting] comes from the Sherriffs Worsteds Mills, and the yarn was made by the Star Worsteds Co., of Fitchburg, the mills which made the inaugural suit of President Taft. I do not say that the cloth for his inaugural suit did not cost more than \$5.25, for that was a finely woven double cloth, but this piece of cloth here [exhibiting] costs \$1.50 per yard. That is the wholesale price, and it is good enough for any gentleman, and the manufacturers are not responsible for the fact that the tailor charges you \$40 or \$50 for the suit, the price which they charge me. You are not going to attack the manufacturers and their workmen in my district and I not say a word, when, as a matter of fact, the manufacturer is not asking an exorbitant price for such a piece of goods.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILDER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman explain if that had been an imported article what the tariff would have been upon it?

Mr. WILDER. I have not that exact information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then will the gentleman answer this: The \$5.25 for which that cloth was laid down to the man who made it up into the suit costing \$40 or \$50 included every possible tariff charge, did it not? I am assuming it is foreign made.

Mr. WILDER. I am not quite in sympathy with the tariff being a tax. But that piece of goods is made and sold in this country against foreign goods, tariff and all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is to say, these goods at \$5.25 for 3½ yards had the benefit of the barrier levied against imported articles at the customhouse?

Mr. WILDER. Quite right.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Hence all the tariff is responsible for is to be found in that \$5.25?

Mr. WILDER. Quite right. Let me follow that a little further, which will clinch that matter. That piece of worsted, I am informed by Mr. Sherriffs, can be purchased for one or one hundred suits. If anybody wants it they can have 3½ yards for \$5.25. If they want to go along through other lines and pay more, well and good, but the manufacturer is not responsible for it, and yet the tariff protects the manufacturer and his men and the industry all along the line.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Assuming that the tariff is paid upon that \$5.25 worth of cloth, and the tailor sells you the suit for \$40, will you please explain wherein the tariff is responsible for the increase in the cost price between \$5.25 and the \$40?

Mr. WILDER. Well, I could if I had time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then there is no tariff action in any of that large increase in the price?

Mr. WILDER. No tariff on the cloth outside of the \$5.25.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me ask further: Is the increase given to labor?

Mr. WILDER. Certainly everything is given to labor. Let some one on the other side of the House show to the contrary if they can.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WILDER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman's argument tend to indicate that the next remedy will be, and must be, to reduce the tariff on the final suit of clothes, the completed manufactured article? Must you not reduce that also?

Mr. WILDER. That is all domestic. The tariff does not touch it. How are you to get a "to-order" suit from abroad?

Mr. HARDY. But if your clothing—if your suits were put on the free list or the tax placed very low on them, that would bring down all these intermediate additions to the cost, would it not?

Mr. WILDER. Yes; but these intermediate additions are labor. I think the concern that made this suit of clothes is doing an honorable business under modern conditions, and I think if you would cut down the tariff on the completed goods it would harm the ready-made suit makers.

Mr. HARDY. Then you think that—

Mr. WILDER. The remedy is not to lower the tariff.

Mr. HARDY. What is it then?

Mr. WILDER. That is not the point I am making. It is not the tariff, excepting as the workmen get it through some route or other.

Mr. HARDY. The point I make is that if you reduce the tariff on a suit of clothes and the manufacturer's product and the tailor's product, all along the line, then the people would get some benefit of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I may be allowed to answer that question I would say that we would probably be buying \$8 suits of clothes all along the line.

Mr. HARDY. And of the same quality.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not at all.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WILDER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Would it not be better for these workmen who work for \$5 a week to be able to buy a suit of clothes for \$8? They can not pay any more.

Mr. WILDER. Well, sir, I do not know of any men who are working for \$5 a week. There are not any in my town, or in my vicinity. There is no use in mincing matters of that kind, and furthermore you can buy plenty of \$8 ready-made suits now, and the man who wants "to order" suits takes them of choice, hence there is no hardship.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the gentleman will look at the reports of the Department of Commerce and Labor he will find those figures there.

Mr. WILDER. I am talking and living in actual life to-day. I am not getting my ideas from printed reports.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have better figures on the worsted business than on the cotton business, but it illustrates the workings of the tariff. Now notice that the mill that makes that piece of worsted, as I have stated, does not make the yarn. There is 89 cents of actual cost (purchase price) in the yarn in that piece of goods per yard. There is 33 cents of labor in that piece of goods, and there is 9 cents of overhead charges in it, and 8 cents of selling expenses, and 11 cents profit, which is, as you will see, less than 7½ per cent profit on that piece of goods which is worth \$1.50 a yard. That is the regular price of that piece of goods, wholesale, to-day.

Now, let us not expect to find the solution of the difficulty in the manufacturer, for \$5.25 for that piece of goods is not a high price. Now, how much can you lower the tariff—answer me this question, now—how much can you lower the tariff on that particular article and not at the same time put some one out of business? You can not lower it without selling that piece of goods for less than \$1.50 a yard. How much can you take out of the profit of 7½ per cent. Does anybody wish to reduce that? There is 8 cents for selling, about 5 per cent. Does anybody want or expect a man to go on the road or elsewhere and sell goods for less than 5 per cent commission? Does any gentleman on that side of the House want to reduce the labor item of 33 cents? Can the overhead charge be reduced that covers the cost of the maintenance of the factory?

It is all well enough to say that we should be able to buy our goods abroad, overlooking entirely the loss of the whole labor in this country, in machinery and the factories and every other thing. Do you think it would make no difference if our goods were made on machines and in factories made abroad and so lose only the machines and factory building? Is not that a strange thought? And yet do we realize what this labor means? Labor means, on metal, from the time it starts from the mines along up through the transportation companies to the furnaces, to the mills, to the factories where it is made up; and what is one man's supply is another man's finished material. The same is true with respect to the farms. Why, over across the way, one gentleman—I think it was the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Mr. HAYBURN—gave a description recently of a ranch where the total expense of running the place for 10 years was \$70,000, and the sales were \$69,000; \$15,000 of the sales, however, was to themselves for fodder, etc. And so we reduce the proposition to a \$55,000 proposition, and \$30,000 of it was for labor, while \$15,000 of it was for interest money, as he apparently borrowed the most of his capital and did not own his whole farm. That made \$15,000 more. That cuts it down to a margin of \$10,000 for his living and for every other affair for 10 years. A great deal of the living is labor. I say the whole thing is labor from beginning to end.

I said 89 cents was for yarn in this piece of cloth. Yes; but I go back to the yarn mill, and I have the figures here. I will not try to give them, as the time is getting so short.

On necessities that can be made in this country the tariff should be so low as to insure a sharp competition; on luxuries the highest compatible with a fair competition. Necessities that can not be made in this country should be free, and on luxuries that can not be made in this country there should be levied the highest collectible rates.

There is much to be said along these lines, and it all argues to this same end. How much labor is there in this yarn? Probably 25 per cent. And then the overhead charge is labor. And then for buildings, machines, and affairs of that sort. The salesmen represent labor. When you come to the question, "What is labor?" it is all labor, including the wool growing.

Even the large income of any man goes right back into labor, for, indeed, the stocks and bonds he buys are issued to pay for labor. When a millionaire builds his fine house it all goes into labor. Indeed, the closer you follow it the more nearly all our activities are sure to turn up as labor.

I remember a story which I read when I was quite young. I guess you have all heard of it. It is the story of a celebrated gentleman in a saddle, who rode from Winchester, 20 miles away; and he came up to the boys and saw them in confusion and defeat and rout and said, "Come on, boys; we will sleep in our own tents to-night."

How would you divide up the pay for what that crowd did? Would it be too much to give that distinguished general one-quarter or one-half of the glory? I use this as an illustration of what goes to make up labor. Are you going to say, because I have not sawed wood to any extent for 10, 15, 25, or 30 years, that I do not labor? I am the one man in our concern who does the most labor, for the longest hours, and bears the biggest burden. I am glad to bear them; I have learned how to bear them. That is what every man should aim for—to bear burdens; but when he comes to do that he has become something of an American, and he certainly is not going to work for \$2.50 or \$5 a week. He is going along up the line somewhere.

A great railroad has recently been looking for a president at a salary of \$100,000 per annum. You say large? Do you think that a salary of \$2,000 per annum large for a man who is competent to manage a business of \$1,000,000—only one-fifth of 1 per cent—but the total business of that railroad is over \$50,000,000 per annum and the salary less than one-fifth of 1 per cent. Do not you suppose that the difference between good and mediocre or bad management would amount to more than one-fifth of 1 per cent? Try it on your own affairs, however large or small, and see. So I say it is all labor, each man being paid the reasonable price that our civilization and progress in Americanism determines.

Now, there is not much politics in this speech, is there? I am just talking about the practical facts of manufacture. It is not my business when I am talking before this House to be a politician. I want to state frankly and clearly that I am a Republican because I believe in the policies, the principles, and the practices of the Republican party. The Republican party intends to stand for that which is right and good and best, and when you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle get anything that we deem to be good, we at once appropriate it. That has been shown in the past. You say we take your platforms. We do not. We simply take that which is good in them and which was probably put there by mistake. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WILDER. This bill will admittedly lessen the revenue about \$3,000,000 and increase the imports about \$11,000,000. In other words, runs at "both spigot and bung" at the same time. The money runs out of the spigot (Treasury) by the lessening revenue and out of the bung hole by the extra money from the country generally to pay for the increased imports. Who ever saw such folly launched as a good business proposition? While it is claimed to be a tariff for revenue only, it admittedly raises some rates and allows others to remain already prohibitive. Hence no revenue whatever, and strange as it may seem, these low-grade cotton cloths, used so largely by the people whom the sponsors for this monstrosity claim to serve and expect it to be overlooked, that in addition to this this grade of goods are largely made by the South, from whence these patriotic gentlemen come. They say the country wants the tariff reduced, presumably regardless of consequences, and that they were ordered to do it last fall, but ask any manufacturer if he wants the tariff reduced on the goods he makes, and he will answer, in no uncertain way, no. Ask the workman if he wants the wages reduced on the specific goods that he makes, and he will cry, no. What, then, they expect that it will be reduced only on the goods that they buy; this is, of course, impossible, for what they buy some one else sells. Where is the trouble, then?

Simply the people have been deceived, and if the framers of this cotton schedule do not know it they might recall that they have not had much experience in tariff making, and that it is no hop, skip, and jump affair when the question might suggest itself to them, if they were sure that they knew enough to make a good bill without more care. In short, would it not be the part of wisdom to await the report of the tariff board, and even then take more time.

I can not end what I have to say better than by quoting that much-loved man of whom we have all heard so many times, Abraham Lincoln. Whatever he says must be good. So I will close with a favorite quotation from him:

I am not bound to win, but I am bound to stand true. I am not bound to succeed, but I must live up to the light I have. I must stand with anyone who stands right, stand with him so long as he stands right, and when he goes wrong, part.

I am not in favor of taking from American labor anything good that it now has or reducing its price. I am in favor of maintaining and increasing it. I am not in favor of the conditions spoken of by the gentleman from Illinois, and do not know where men are working at that price. I would not tolerate them in any factory with which I was connected. If I could not do better than that I would get out of that business. Yet I am aware that there are certain kinds of business in our country where these near-Americans are working, but we hope they will come out of those conditions and be better and larger and bigger at some later time. I will certainly turn in and try to help them. Will you, gentlemen on the other side of the aisle? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall].

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, the schedule to which this bill relates is one of two of the most complicated schedules in the tariff. It is one upon which only an expert is qualified to speak, and an expert I do not claim in any sense to be. But there are certain obvious things about this schedule and about this bill which a novice may see, and some of these things I shall attempt to bring to your attention.

In the first place, the business of manufacturing cotton is a great national industry; it is not in any sense a sectional industry. There was a time when the manufacture of cotton was confined largely to the New England States, but it is now an important industry in, I think, 16 States of the Union; and in the States of the South, where in 1880 it had developed only to a very slight extent, it has since that time increased more than 1,000 per cent; and they to-day make into cotton manufactures more than 200,000 bales of cotton each year, more than all the New England States combined. That shows that however well adapted the soil of the South is to the raising of the cotton plant—and it has a practical monopoly in raising cotton in all the world—yet it is no more adapted to that than are the industry and genius of her people to the manufacture of that plant into cotton goods. There is a tendency for gain there which we have seen for 30 years, which is still continuing, and it is no idle dream to look two or three generations ahead and see made on the southern soil nearly all the cotton that is raised there; and, as I say, in the raising of cotton they have a practical monopoly.

So there was no necessity, Mr. Chairman, even if gentlemen wanted to be sectional, for them in revising the cotton manufacturing schedule to temper the bill so much to the present condition of the industry in the South, for they have not yet developed in the South the manufacture of the higher grades as they have in the North, but there is a constant improvement; and if the authors of this bill were considering merely the South and had looked to the future, they would not have written in the bill the sectional lines that I shall point out before I close.

This report, which has the appearance of a very learned document, says that the cotton-manufacturing duties cost the American people some \$200,000,000 a year. That I think is a pure assumption; it is a pure guess; but it is interesting for another purpose to consider the reasoning which the committee adopted in reaching that conclusion. They say that the average ad valorem of the cotton schedule is 56 per cent, and then they assume that only one-half of that percentage is effective, and they generously figure that half at 25 per cent, and they say 25 per cent of the cotton duties are effective and the rest are surplusage. Now, that is an interesting admission, coming from the greatest aggregation of free-trade statesmen at present performing on the Continent of North America [laughter]—that you can not add the duty in fixing the price to a domestic consumer. For they very generously throw out 31 per cent of this duty which they say is not effective and should not be added to the price.

But follow them one step further and see what they do. Having decided that all above 25 per cent is surplusage and should

not count, they say they are going to relieve the people from robbery and from extortion and from the greed that we have heard about on this floor. How? Why, they are going to leave the schedule at 27 per cent; they are going to leave the 25 per cent and then add 2 per cent more for the robbers to come and go on to be sure that they get it all. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

This estimate, as I said, of the cost of the schedule at two hundred millions is nothing more than a guess. I think that the same thing may be said of the estimate of the committee, that the duties under the proposed bill will stimulate importations only to the extent of \$10,000,000 a year. I question very much whether that is true. I do not know whether that estimate is any nearer the truth than one I heard a few days ago by one of the greatest cotton manufacturers in the country, who said that the duty in this bill would stimulate importations to the amount of \$200,000,000 a year.

I think both are guesses, but with millions of idle spindles in Europe, with only half of the labor cost which we have in this country, with the duties upon the Payne bill where you reduced them at a point where there are millions of importations into this country, it seems to me that if you cut those duties absolutely in two you will stimulate importations many, many times over \$10,000,000 a year. I do not believe there is any escape from that conclusion.

But I said that this bill was drawn upon sectional lines. It is put forth here as a general revision of the cotton schedule. The first paragraph of the section relating to cloth fixes the duty upon the low-grade cotton cloth at 15 per cent. Let us see how that compares with the Payne bill. The Payne bill fixes the duty upon cotton cloth up to 7 cents a yard at 1 cent a yard. That is, upon cloth worth 7 cents a yard the Payne duty would be 14½ per cent. Under this bill it would be 15 per cent. As to the grades lower than 7 cents, let me show you how you would get an increase of duty by the difference between the operation of a specific and an ad valorem duty. Upon these lower grades of cotton, heavy in weight, often the value of the raw material is the great cost of production. Nearly two-thirds in some cases of the cost of goods, I understand, is represented by the cost of the cotton. At 12 cents a pound upon these lower grades you would get substantially the same rate as you do upon the Payne bill. But suppose cotton goes to 15 cents a pound, and the tendency is for a constant increase in the price of cotton; you will get an increase in the duty over the rate in the Payne bill. Then take the next step. The cotton goods that are valued at 9 cents a yard under the Payne bill, unbleached, carry a duty of 1½ cents a yard.

Under this bill the duty is 15 per cent ad valorem, which will be 1.35 cents a yard, still an increase. Advance one step further and get to the goods that are bleached, dyed, painted, printed, and so forth, where up to 12 cents the Payne bill is 2 cents per yard, or 16½ per cent ad valorem. Your duty is 20 per cent, which is an increase of about 20 per cent over the Payne bill duty. Get to the upper grades of cotton, where the value of the raw material is a very slight element in the cost of manufacture, where, perhaps, it is not over 4 per cent of the cost of manufacture, where they have two and three and four hundred threads to the inch, and where the great cost is labor, goods that are manufactured for the wealthy people and that are luxuries, and you give those consumers relief to the extent of 50 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will challenge the gentleman to show from the returns of last year, published by the Treasury Department, where the ad valorem rate in the Payne bill on the same class of goods, the lower class of goods, is anywhere lower than the rate fixed in this bill.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has been paying attention to what I have been saying, he will know that I have quoted from the Payne law, as it is contained in the gentleman's report, and from his bill, and if he will look over the instances that I have cited he will find no reason to doubt what I have said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the lowest rate in this bill is 20 per cent on the low class of goods, and I would like to have the gentleman point out any class of low goods—I do not mean to take one particular item—where it is in the Payne bill anything like as low as that.

Mr. McCALL. What I have said will be printed in the Record to-morrow morning, and I think if the gentleman will examine it he will find that I have stated the exact truth, and taken it from his bill and his version of the Payne bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would state to the gentleman that I am satisfied that in this low class of goods he will not find anywhere where the reduction in this bill is not very much greater than the same class of goods in the Payne bill.

Mr. McCALL. If the gentleman will read his own report—

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pardon me just for a moment?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I turned to this book incidentally—I have not studied the question, and refer to the 9 cents a yard with a duty at a cent and a quarter, and I find the ad valorem is 10.92 last year—

Mr. McCALL. Well, I cited the cost to the House.

Mr. HILL. Six and thirty-six one-hundredths in 1909 and 9.17 the year before that.

Mr. McCALL. I cited three distinct instances to the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I stated to the gentleman from Massachusetts I did not refer to particular items, but to the general class of goods proposed to be covered by the law. We must take the class together. I am not talking about a particular item.

Mr. HILL. This refers to bleached goods, value not over 9 cents per square yard, and not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, and which, I understand the gentleman, is 15 per cent in his bill and 10 under the Payne bill.

Mr. McCALL. Painted and bleached is 20 per cent on the 12-cent grade. In the Payne bill it was 16½. That is, you have increased the duty on some of these cheap goods 20 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman can take an item here and there where for some particular reason it may have been brought in at a very low rate, but I say the class of lower goods fixed in this bill is materially lower than the Payne bill and lower than the upper ones as fixed in that bill. The gentleman can not sustain his proposition.

Mr. McCALL. I am not imitating the method of reasoning that gentlemen on the other side have adopted in treating what is called the stepladder specifics, so as to show the great increase of duty in the Payne bill, and the great mass of speeches on the other side are built upon just such instances. I assert that there is no substantial decrease on those lower kinds of cotton goods and there are some very substantial increases, and I am willing to stand upon that statement. Now, I am going to follow that a step further. Here is a bill drawn avowedly, as the authors say, in the interest of the masses of the people, and they take the low-cost goods, the goods that are consumed by the poor people, by the working people of the country, and they either do not materially decrease the duties or they increase the duties, and they take these luxurious fabrics in which labor is the great cost, which are near silks, which are deemed luxuries and which are consumed by wealthy people, and to those people they give a reduction to the extent of nearly 50 per cent. That is, this bill is drawn in the interest of the wealthy class and is drawn in defiance of the interest of the great mass of the poor people of the country. Now, why is this done? If you will look over the statistics of manufactures you will find that the goods to which I have been referring are manufactured chiefly in the Southern States, and the goods to which the schedule applies which are made in the South have very little reduction made upon them, and some of them have increases made upon them. That is, your bill draws a class line and it draws a sectional line. Now, we know that a great many of these cotton goods that are being made in the northern mills to-day are very high-priced and that the chief cost in the production is the cost of labor. Suppose we cut down the duties—and there are now millions of importations of such goods under this schedule—suppose we cut down the duties, why, obviously, with duties at the importing point, the foreign goods will come in in greater volume, and the only way in which our manufacturers can meet them is to cut down the cost of production. They can not reduce the price of cotton. The price of cotton is not very material in the production of those goods, but, even if it were material, they can not reduce it, but their great item in the cost of production is the cost of labor, the wages of labor, and it is inevitable, if our mills desire to keep running under this drastic cut that you have here, that the wage cost of the goods should be reduced.

I am not able to see upon just what theory this bill is drawn. If you look at the importations you will find that in those paragraphs where there are now practically no importations, where we have no foreign competitor, where the duty is prohibitive, they keep the duties where they are or they increase them. Certainly they can not be upon a revenue basis. And upon the other goods, where we have free importations, they make a still further cut.

Now, gentlemen talk about the principle of tariff for revenue only. You would think from the way they argue about that

sacred dogma that it was contained in the Constitution of the United States. But Congress has the power to levy taxes and duties and imposts without any limitation, and it can exercise its high sovereign prerogative and discretion in any way that it thinks would be for the benefit of the country. But gentlemen contend that they are to exercise this taxing power without reference to the consequences upon the condition of the country or upon production. Why, in that way you would impose upon a given industry a tax which might prevent it from growing. It might prevent it from reaching that stage where it would be a great revenue producer, where it would add to the wealth of the country and to the efficiency of the taxing power of the country. It is a very narrow view to take that in drawing a revenue bill you are to proceed with regard to revenue only and that you are not to consider in the exercise of your discretion its incidental and most far-reaching effects.

Now, there is the wool bill, which the House has just sent back to the Senate and upon which it has asked for a conference. Let me call your attention to the progress of this bill through the House. When it first appeared here there were a large number of gentlemen upon that side of the House in favor of the ancient Democratic doctrine of free wool.

A candidate of that party three times for the Presidency and its leader declared himself in favor of free wool; and, after a great effort, helped along and seconded by the Democratic caucus, they finally decided to impose a revenue duty of 20 per cent upon wool, a result much at variance with the recent practices and professions of the party and with the belief of its leaders. And but a little while ago we saw all the Democratic Members of another legislative body in this country voting unanimously in favor of the duty of 35 per cent upon raw wool, a percentage which in times when wool was high and when we specially would want to get it into the country at as low a rate as possible would give an equivalent specific rate equal to the rate in the present Payne law. And that is the bill that has been sent back to the House and which the House to-day has complaisantly asked for a conference upon. Now, I remember hearing read in this House on a somewhat parallel occasion, when the Wilson bill was returned here with some 640 amendments, a letter from the Democratic President of the United States denouncing that measure as one of "party perfidy and party dishonor," and yet, after the pretense of a struggle, I saw the Democratic House of Representatives accept every amendment proposed by the Senate. I do not know what you gentlemen propose to-day. I do not know how far the alliance has progressed, but I am wondering if you are going to imitate your predecessors in the Fifty-third Congress, when you will perhaps not even get a tariff bill, but when you will have the pleasure of surrendering your principles and of committing an act of party perfidy and party dishonor.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. McCALL. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. While the gentleman is trying to anticipate the future, could he tell us what the Republican President would be likely to do with the bill when it came up to him?

Mr. McCALL. I will give my guess at it. I do not pretend to know what the President will do. I see what the newspapers are saying, which is that he will veto the bill. And I am wondering if that should happen if the gentlemen on the other side will be seen to go down with their ship of tariff reform or whether they will be upon a protective bark. [Applause on the Republican side].

Now, this industry is one of the great industries in the United States. It is a great American industry, and I believe can be made a distinctive American industry. We have, as I said, a monopoly of the raising of the cotton plant, and I believe that, ultimately, under wise laws, we will approach a monopoly in the manufacture of cottons.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCALL. I will.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman left his statement as to the rate of duty under the Wilson bill. The Wilson law put wool on the free list, did it not?

Mr. McCALL. Yes. Even that measure of "party perfidy and party dishonor" had wool on the free list. They had some Democratic features left in their bill.

Mr. COOPER. As I heard the gentleman, it seemed he left it where we would understand that it was 20 per cent.

Mr. McCALL. No; I did not mean that. The Wilson bill provided for free wool.

Mr. COOPER. It made wool free, but put 70 per cent tax on rice. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCALL. The total production of our cotton manufacturers to-day is close to the billion mark. They employ more than half a million people, and the wages of that industry give sustenance and support probably to 2,000,000 people. It is a great industry, and it deserves fair treatment. It deserves fairer treatment than it is likely to get upon the bill based upon this voluminous report containing crude assumptions and mutually destructive theories and undigested statistics that make this great volume bulge from one end to the other with inaccuracies. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If we are to deal with this industry, let us deal with it intelligently. Let us at least pass a bill, in the passing of which we can maintain serious countenances. If we are going to lead it to the slaughter, let us carve it into a dish fit for the gods and not hew it into a carcass fit for the hounds. [Applause on the Republican side.] And for my part, I do not propose to join in a night assault which may be destructive of one of the fairest of American industries.

It has been well known, Mr. Chairman, that the Tariff Board is investigating this question. There could not be an abler tribunal for the consideration of an economic question than is the Tariff Board. It has at the head of it Prof. Emery, who was at the head of the department of economics in Yale University. It has one of the leading members of the faculty of the University of Virginia. It has men who are expert in economic lines. And they have been investigating this question, and have promised a report to this Congress by the 1st of December next.

Your own bill, by its terms, does not take effect until the 1st of January, and why should we not wait until we can avail ourselves of the studies of that board and have the evidence which they are gathering, so that it may help us in what we are about to do? I think this bill is emphatically a leap in the dark. It may be that some of these duties should be decreased. I should be willing to vote that they should be decreased, but I think that before I so vote I am justified in awaiting the evidence of this board, for the principle of which—that of a Tariff Commission—so many eminent gentlemen on that side of the House voted only last winter.

Now, I had in view to say a few words upon the general result of the Payne bill during its operation.

Mr. PAYNE. We will give you more time.

Mr. McCALL. I have heard gentlemen on the other side claim that the Payne bill increased duties. We have in this very report a statement that the duties in the cotton schedule were increased from 25 to 460 per cent, and yet in another place they say the average increase of duties was from 54 to 56 per cent. That is 2 per cent. They do not mention the fact that by reason of a decision of the courts separating a proviso from the paragraph which the authors of the Dingley bill intended to have it apply to and in connection with which it was enforced for four years that the duties on luxurious cotton fabrics were reduced from 60 per cent to 4 and 5 per cent. There was an increase in those instances in the Payne bill, and the justice of making them is shown in this very bill, because you increase those duties at least 500 per cent over what they were in the Dingley bill. And it would be a gross distortion of the idea of Democracy for anyone to stand for the theory that the low-priced goods should pay 15 or 20 or 25 per cent on coming into this country while the luxurious fabrics should come in for only 5 per cent.

I was going to say a word about the general operation of the Payne bill. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has handed me a letter which he received from the Department of Commerce and Labor, responding to a request by him for a statement showing the average ad valorem rate of duties on imports during the fiscal year just ended. From that it appears that the free imports into the United States during the year ending on June 30 last were \$777,000,000; that the dutiable imports were \$749,000,000—that is, that more than half of all the goods coming into this country came in under the Payne bill free of all duty—and that the customs receipts were \$313,000,000, showing an average ad valorem duty upon all goods of 20.54 per cent, which is lower than the rate under the Dingley law, lower than the rate under the Democratic Wilson law, and lower than that under the McKinley law.

If you will look at the figures showing the operation of the Wilson bill, of the Dingley bill, and of the McKinley bill during the full period when they were in force you will find that the Payne law shows a lower ad valorem upon dutiable goods than any of them. It shows a lower ad valorem upon all goods coming into the country than any of them, and especially for the year 1910, which was the last full year that I had when I made the comparison. It shows a reduction from the Dingley duties

averaging 17 per cent upon dutiable goods. And yet gentlemen say that this was a revision upward.

And not merely did it reduce the duty upon dutiable goods from the Dingley bill 17 per cent, but it has put great items like hides upon the free list entirely, which do not appear at all in that calculation.

For the first time in the history of the country during the last year the total exports from this country to other countries exceeded \$2,000,000,000. We had the greatest foreign trade that we have ever had.

Mr. Chairman, when we come to consider these simple facts, first that under the Payne bill we have the greatest exports that we ever had and for the first time more than \$2,000,000,000; that we have the greatest foreign trade that we ever had; that we have a less average ad valorem on dutiable goods than under any of the last four great tariff bills; and that we have a less ad valorem upon all goods than under any of the last great tariff bills, including even the Democratic Wilson bill, it seems to me if these facts can be made known, the clamor, the prejudice, and the misinformation that have been scattered abroad about this bill will be dispelled, and that it will be seen to accomplish some of the great objects for which a revenue bill is established.

And then let me call your attention to one other matter. During the two years before the Payne bill took effect we had a deficit of about \$80,000,000, or about \$40,000,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. McCALL. We were not at liberty to throw away revenue. We had to address ourselves to the problem of providing money to meet the running expenses of the Government. What was the result? Although in the two years preceding the operation of this bill the average deficit was \$40,000,000, in the first year in which this bill was in operation the surplus was \$15,000,000 and in the second year it was \$47,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] We had an average surplus in the two years of \$30,000,000; and if gentlemen on the other side of the House want to study a way by which they may create a system for revenue only or a system that will benefit the country or that will extend its foreign trade or that will increase its domestic industry, I commend them to the study of the provisions of the Payne law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose, and Mr. BURLESON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) making appropriations of certain expenses of the House of Representatives, incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had disagreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 2, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. CULBERSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party, in control of the lower House, has undertaken revision downward of certain tariff schedules that are notoriously oppressive.

In so far as the Senate is concerned no revision would be possible but for the indignant cry of the people, who had repudiated the Payne-Aldrich monstrosity. Even a Republican President, whose signature made this act a law, admits that many of the schedules are indefensible, particularly the wool schedule.

Under the present high tariff rates, which have existed with few changes during a long period of unbroken Republican rule, monopolies and combines have sprung up a hundred times greater in number than during any like period of this country's history. So bold, so oppressive, so shamelessly corrupt and corrupting have been these creatures of Republican misrule that even the fostering mother, the Republican Party, would gladly repudiate the relationship were her hands not stained with part of the plunder. [Applause on the Democratic side.] She can not wipe out the campaign contributions exacted of these her wayward children. Prosecutions of the Standard Oil Trust, the Tobacco Trust, and others by the present administration are to be commended in so far as the executive officers are concerned, but as to the party the act reminds me of an old negro

in my town who had made a good Sunday dinner on a chicken that his boy had stolen, and when the theft was brought home to him, thought it ample satisfaction that he whip the boy soundly. [Laughter.]

Whether or not I am entirely orthodox on the question of Government taxation, it is my belief that a well-regulated tariff next to an income tax is the most equitable method and is attended with less friction than any plan that can be devised for raising revenue. The complaint of the people is not with the tariff, but with tariff abuses. I can vote consistently for an income tax, a corporation tax, or an inheritance tax, in the conviction that many of those who are liable have robbed the people under Government sanction, and it is a maxim of law that the owners of stolen goods have the right to take them wherever found. If the Government can be brought to this view, with the purpose of evening up things, no harm is done.

We hear much of high tariff and high wages going hand in hand. To quote the words of a leading manufacturer in my own State, Mr. Lewis W. Parker, for whose ability and integrity I have the greatest respect, "the wages of cotton-mill employees are already low and below the basis of a majority of industries." Bulletin 57 of the Census Bureau, page 93, shows that 44,452 youths and men, 24,552 girls and women, and 3,743 children under 16 years of age employed in the manufacture of woolen goods receive a weekly average of \$7.61. Employees of the steel mills of Pittsburg, Chicago, and Milwaukee, all strong, healthy men, receive \$1.75 for 12 hours a day 7 days in the week—\$12.25. In these averages are included the wages of skilled mechanics and head men. And let it ever be remembered that these are high-tariff prices. It would seem then that under the highest tariff rates operatives' wages are abnormally low. The workingman in highly protected Germany has somewhat the advantage in wages and hours over the workingman in highly protected France. The workingman in free-trade England has a shade the advantage over the workingman in highly protected Germany.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said in Republican speeches here about the tremendous cost of labor that I should like to ask the gentleman if he has statistics with reference to the cost of labor in the South, in New England, and in England?

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina. The average weekly wage paid in cotton mills in England is \$6.37. The average weekly wage in New England is \$7. The average weekly wage in the southern mills is \$4.10.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. BOWMAN. I should like to ask if the gentleman has any information tending to show the difference in efficiency of the labor, and whether the price paid to the labor is not somewhat dependent upon efficiency?

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina. My information and understanding is that the labor employed in southern mills is just as efficient and well disciplined as the labor in New England mills or in the mills of old England.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I should like to ask the gentleman if the average wage scale that he just spoke of applies exclusively to the cotton mills?

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina. Yes. Admitting that high tariff and prosperity for many years have gone hand in hand, it has been a tariff paid by the masses and absorbed by a select few. One-tenth of the population of the United States owns more than four-fifths of its entire wealth.

Now, it is a fact that the American laborer is paid more per day than is the European laborer, but it is admitted that, as a whole, improved machinery, improved methods of business, and the greater skill of the American laborer give him nearly twice the earning capacity. Not the rate of wages, but the output, is the governing standard of measurement. And then, too, the price of labor is controlled in large measure by the supply. In the congested populations of Europe labor is more than ample, while here it is inadequate. I was impressed by a statement made in a recent speech by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD], in which he spoke of a friend of his getting a contract recently for several million dollars' worth of locomotives in open competition with Germany and England. The contract was awarded in Japan. While there he was told by a master mechanic of the Imperial Railways shops that locomotives could be manufactured cheaper in Japan than in America, because, said he, "we only pay one-fifth the wages to our men that you pay yours." A comparison of their cost books on the same specifications showed that the labor cost on the Japanese locomotive was three and one-half times as great as that of the American locomotive.

Another interesting statement by this gentleman, who is himself a manufacturer, was to the effect that he had proposed to a manufacturer of certain staple articles in Birmingham, England, that he manufacture the same articles for him in America, lay them down for him at his shop, and allow the Birmingham man a profit of 10 per cent above the American charges and carriage.

American locomotives to the number of 720 may be found in Japan. Americans are selling yarn in China; they are selling electrical machinery in Calcutta, and they are selling shoes there at \$3.85 that cost the home consumer \$5; they are selling goods in every country in Europe, and are furnishing bridge material and railroad supplies even in darkest Africa. When American goods are being sold in every extensive market of the world, it is folly to speak of the foreign manufacturer invading the home market. Here are a few American-made articles advertised in one foreign journal, and being sold in open competition with Germany and England: Ironmongery, fine tools, bicycles, sporting goods, lamps, razors, firearms, carriage makers' supplies, sanitary goods, lighting systems, dry goods, men's furnishings, office devices, stationery, typewriters, filing cabinets, printers' supplies, paper, machine tools, boilers, lubricants, electrical material, valves, woodworking machinery, belting, shafting, pulleys, packing, furniture, kitchen ware, and hundreds of other articles from a protected market to the open markets of the world. And yet we are told that we can not compete in foreign markets.

Perhaps there was a time when the wage earner of America was dependent upon high tariffs for the higher price of his labor, but that was in the days of infant industries, long since passed.

Under conditions foisted on the public by Republican misrule the question of tariff revision must be approached with a two-fold care. Rates must be sufficient to raise revenue adequate for the needs of an extravagant Government, and they should not be lowered so as to cripple any American industry that is not fully equipped to meet foreign competition. Whether or not many of our industries have been created and maintained artificially by protection we will not discuss. The fact is, they are here, and they are American industries. In this spirit the Democrats have taken the initiative in revising the rates on wool, an article as necessary to rich and poor alike as the food they eat. Can any man honestly justify a duty of 95.57 per cent on expensive blankets and 105.5 per cent on the cheaper grades, which was the actual duty paid on these articles of common consumption during the past year? The duty on cheap clothes is prohibitive. Clothes valued at 40 cents per pound carry a duty of 144.05 per cent; those between 40 and 70 cents per pound carry a duty of 123.55 per cent. Clothes that may be bought by the wealthier people, valued at 70 cents per pound and over, carry a duty of 96.02 per cent. It is evidently the policy of the Republican Party to make the burden lightest where it is easiest borne.

I have not treated this subject from the standpoint of the millions of American people, something like 85 per cent of the whole, who have no direct or indirect interest in high tariffs, but must pay tariff-made prices to enrich a few capitalists, perhaps 2 per cent of the population. The man who drives the plow or stands behind the counter or works at the carpenter's trade, the lawyer, doctor, teacher—in fact, everybody except those directly interested in manufacturing—by what right are they taxed to the limit for the enrichment of a few?

What I have had to say on the general subject of tariff reduction is by way of preface to the subject that I desire to discuss. South Carolina is the second State in the Union in the manufacture of cotton goods, and the district that I have the honor to represent is one of the principal manufacturing districts. Believing that the people of the United States as a whole have reached the limit of endurance, I have advocated a reduction of tariff affecting other sections, and I can not consistently shut my eyes to some of the prohibitive rates on cotton goods. Raw cotton does not enter into the discussion, for the demand for it is world-wide; our exports alone exceed the total amount raised outside of this country, and the price is made in Liverpool.

To demonstrate that the rates on cotton goods are prohibitive, we have but to note that only 4.17 per cent of the revenue of this Government raised under the Payne-Aldrich Act during the past year was for cotton goods imported. I do not believe, however, that England would flood this country with cotton goods even if the tariff wall were razed entirely, so great is our advantage of location in the home of raw cotton. I would not favor the removal of the tariff, but I do favor a reduction that will give the American manufacturer a reasonable advantage, and which would add to the revenue from this source.

It is a fact that for two years cotton manufacturers in this country have been running on small profit, and in many in-

stances at a loss. It is evident, then, that something more than a prohibitive tariff is necessary to insure permanent and continuous success. As long as the demands of our local market exceeded our local supply of cotton goods cotton mills flourished, many of them doubling their capacity and laying up large surpluses. The habit of depending on a protected home market has become so fixed that now, when the supply far exceeds the demand and goods are piled up in warehouses for want of local buyers, the industry is paralyzed. Like a child that has fed too long at the mother's pantry, they are afraid of the competition of the world. While the cotton manufacturers of the United States have been taking waning profits from a protected and now glutted home market, England has been reaching out for the oriental trade. I can not recall the exact figures, but as I remember, in a statement published something like a year ago, it appeared that England sold 10 yards of cloth in China for every yard sold by this country; and yet both of these countries combined have scarcely touched the trade that may be opened up there. The hope of the cotton industry in this country is not in a tariff that will keep out moderate competition, but in concerted effort to cultivate new fields for the output. A few mills combined and put an agent in the vicinity of the Red Sea, with the result that American-made cotton goods were sold in the ascendant there. Every section of the civilized world should have an agent, not of a particular mill, nor of a particular kind of cloth, but to establish friendly commercial relations with the people and incidentally to place American goods. The idea should be to stimulate consumption in foreign countries where the use of cotton goods is scant, rather than curtail output and depend solely upon an uncertain market at home.

I touched on this subject in a recent newspaper interview. I believe that I would go further than any suggestion that I have heard and say that I would vote for a measure looking to the establishment of a trades department of this Government that would put an agent of American-made products in every inviting market of the world at the Government's expense. Find a market for the goods and I will show you expanded investment and higher rates of wages, tariff or no tariff. Depend wholly on a circumscribed market and the minute your supply oversteps local demand you will have that stagnation which has characterized the cotton-fabric market of the United States for the past four years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A committee of cotton manufacturers memorialized Congress in behalf of present rates on cotton goods, and said: "The cotton schedule is now on a competitive basis as far as the majority of it is concerned." Let us inquire how misleading and how wide of the truth is this statement. Our facts are taken from a statement made by Mr. L. W. Parker to the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Parker is one of the largest and one of the most successful manufacturers of cotton goods in the United States, and his frankness in contravention of certain statements made by certain other manufacturers are not only deserving of serious consideration but are a worthy example for all manufacturers who would ask concessions of Congress. Realizing that Congress will deal fairly when fairly dealt with, he advocates reduction now rather than meet the storm when it has swept further and has broadened its track. He believes that settled conditions and expanded trade will be worth more than prohibitive tariffs that are now impotent to protect against an overtopping and ever-increasing surplus of manufactured goods. Referring to a class of goods known as lawns and domestics, after figuring every possible cost, he shows that the duty on this class of goods is one and one-half times the entire manufacturing cost. Referring to print cloth, such as is used for underwear, printed for percales, and bleached for cambrics and muslins, he shows that the duty thereon is more than 100 per cent of the entire cost of manufacture. On a still finer texture, lawns and like goods, the duty is over 100 per cent. On a corded effect, used for making shirts, the duty is one and three-fourths times the entire cost of manufacture. A colored stripe, bleached, he finds carries a duty of two and one-half times the total manufacturers' cost.

I have not reproduced the elaborate and interesting deductions made by Mr. Parker, nor have I stated all the instances in his report. I have left out several classes of goods where the rate of duty is the same as some of those that I have mentioned, but I have given the lowest rates as well as some of the highest. He very properly concludes that with prohibitive rates the cotton manufacturing industry in this country has gone through two years of the greatest depression known in its history, and the time has come to look for something else besides high tariff for relief.

Mr. Parker's suggestion as to new rates, placing all classes of goods on an ad valorem basis, is technical in its nature, but it seems from a study of it that the rates suggested would afford the American manufacturer ample protection. There is no

question of his ability as a manufacturer; there is absolutely no question of his sincerity. It is not likely that he would recommend a reduction that would prove disastrous to the trade; and when he thinks a duty apportioned according to the grade of cloth and ranging from 20 to 40 per cent will not cripple the trade we are disposed to accept it. It seems to me that even a Republican might accept this in good faith and be in strict accord with his last platform declaration. We quote that declaration, following the facts just stated, to show what elasticity the Republicans have given the words "reasonable profits":

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

Mr. Chairman, I would not cripple the cotton-mill industry. Next to steel, cotton is more extensively used in industrial development than any other commodity, and many millions of yards of cotton cloth are annually used for purposes other than clothing. Perhaps it would be safe to say that a million bales of cotton are annually manufactured into cloth to be used in the industrial arts.

In the strength of the cotton-manufacturing industry my State has risen from the ashes of war to the second place in the picture. All through what is known as the Piedmont section of South Carolina may be seen the towering smokestack, like so many giant exclamations of progress. When agricultural products were at a discount in the markets, and each year added to the mortgage debt until it swept away the farm, many of our people, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, turned to the mill and found there employment and with it food and clothing for their children. I regret exceedingly that tariff rates no longer assure a profitable business in cotton manufacturing; I sympathize to the fullest with those good men and women who during the past two years have had their wages or time reduced or have been turned out of employment; but this is only a note of warning to our captains of industry to establish additional trade relations in the markets of the world to absorb the increasing surplus of manufactured goods. Assuming that Mr. Parker is correct that the new tariff rates suggested by him will not cripple the industry or cause the reduction of wages, recent legislation by Congress taking the tariff off of the necessities of life and bringing the cost of living down will make for the betterment of all our people. We all know how nearly the earnings of the laborer are adjusted now to the necessities of life and how few, with the help of the entire family, ever lay up a surplus. Is there not here a study for the mill owners? It does seem that the practice of shutting down the mills, threatening a reduction of wages, cutting out a large per cent of wage earners, so unsatisfactory to the mill owners and so disastrous to the operatives, could be avoided by a little more scientific study of the problem. I repeat, in conclusion, that I believe the solution lies not in curtailed output, not in reduced wages, but in an expanded market. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, Schedule I, the cotton schedule, which this bill revises, deals with some of the commonest articles of clothing and household use. There is hardly one among our 90,000,000 people who does not wear cotton in some form or other. All are interested in this revision. The Democratic bill now before the committee proposes to reduce the average rate of taxation of the Payne-Aldrich bill on those articles from 56 per cent ad valorem to a little more than 27 per cent ad valorem. And in this process of reduction it is believed by our committee that the revenue will not be materially disturbed, the burden of taxation upon the American people will be lifted in the amount of \$200,000,000, and that at the same time the wages of industry will not be unfavorably affected, nor will the cotton-manufacturing concerns of the United States suffer any hardship.

One of the features of the Payne-Aldrich bill which has provoked the greatest indignation in our country has been the series of raises in the cotton schedule, and the history of those raises is the history of an extraordinary conspiracy by special privilege.

The cotton spinners of New England selected as their agents to appear here in the last Congress two gentlemen, named HENRY F. LIPPITT and James R. McColl. They were instructed by those who sent them down here to see that the rates of the cotton schedule were not changed. These two gentlemen charged with that mission came to Washington, and one at least, I think both of them, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and advocated that the rates in the cotton bill be not changed. But thereafter, by some curious process of intrigue, they contrived that the report by the Ways and Means Committee to the House should contain a series of mysterious

reclassifications which raised the rates of duty in some cases 25 per cent, and in some cases many times 25 per cent, without an ordinary man being able to ascertain just what had happened.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, upon discovering the effect of these proposed changes in classification, arose on the floor and declared that he had been tricked and misled and struck those changes from the bill. They reappeared in the Senate, they stayed in the bill, and they became the law. Those are the rates which we are now reducing downward.

Upon the actual importation under those rates in the last current year, it is found that the effect of this reclassification was to raise the rates on cotton cloth from 37 to 42 per cent ad valorem, and to raise the rates on stockings from 60 to 71 per cent ad valorem.

Now, the work was done in the dark and in secret, and it was done at the behest of the two men whom I have named, and supposedly at the request of the interests which they represented down here. But the cotton spinners of New England were agast when they discovered what had been accomplished. They said, "Boys, you have killed the goose which lays the golden egg." Because they saw plainly that the result of this raise in rates would be to arouse the American people in revolt, and they reaped the whirlwind in the last November election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, these same interests in New England are instigating a propagandum to the effect that the Democratic cotton bill will shut down the mills of the United States, throw the working people out of employment in some cases, and reduce wages in all. That is the kind of argument to which those of us who have served some terms in this House have been familiar with, lo, these many years, but to-day it rings an unresponsive note in the ears of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But the manufacturers of New England have to put down wages when the tariff is high; they claim they have to put down wages when the tariff is low. They put down wages when they are prosperous and they put down wages when times are hard. Their only aim and purpose in politics seems to be to create the idea that if there is any tariff reduction labor has to suffer.

Now, of course, I do not mean to assert that all the manufacturers in the United States are content with the proposed cotton bill. Nor do I mean to assert that some of them are not alarmed at these proposed rates, but I think that for generations past many of these manufacturers have been nursing ghosts, for the tariff makes cowards of us all.

It is conceivable that the approach of a reduction in duties might alarm some of them in the same way that the rumor of the death of some great plunger on the New York stock market might throw the market temporarily into despair, although the removal of that speculator from the scene of his mundane activities might be the best thing that ever happened to the New York stock market. But I do deny that any cotton mill in the United States will close down and remain closed on account of this bill. The closing of a factory is one of the most brutal political weapons of the high protectionists. Many a time during campaigns they have coerced their employees with threats of closing down in the event of Democratic victory. Some of them are even capable now of carrying that threat into effect, but, unfortunately for their logic, the depression in the cotton trade has been going on since the Roosevelt panic of 1907. Since February, 1910, it has been acute.

I do not believe that the honest and sincere manufacturer can maintain that the increased importations of one-half of 1 per cent which will follow the establishment of these rates will subject him to a competition which will cause him to shut down his plant. But they say some of the plants are now shut down. Some of them have been shut down off and on for the last three or four years. The cotton manufacturing industry is already in some places in extremis. Why, gentlemen on the other side of the House and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] in particular maintain that it was the threat of Democratic tariff legislation which did this. I have here the Textile Manufacturers Journal of September 10, 1910, published two months before the election of the Democratic House of Representatives, in which it is shown that all over the United States textile manufacturing plants were then being shut down.

KNITTING MILLS IDLE.

The Oswego (N. Y.) Knitting Co. has closed its plant for three weeks. About 150 operatives are employed by the company. The machinery and equipment in the plant of the Reading (Pa.) Glove and Mitten Manufacturing Co. will be sold at auction on the premises. The sale will take place October 12.

The Williamsburg (Va.) Knitting Mill Co. became a voluntary bankrupt in the Norfolk Federal court on September 1. The high cost of cotton was given by the company as causing the failure.

Creditors of the Aken Knitting Co., Philmont, N. Y., will hold a meeting on September 16 to consider the sale of the property. Operations have not been carried on at the Philmont plant for some time.

The Henrietta (N. C.) Mills have closed for a week to give the operatives a vacation.

After an idleness of 10 days or more the Tremont and Suffolk Mills and the Massachusetts Cotton Mills, of Lowell, Mass., resumed operations on Tuesday.

The Everett Mills and Pacific Mills, of Lawrence, which shut down on August 1, will resume work on Tuesday.

Five hundred operatives of the Empress Mills, of Augusta, Ga., will welcome September 12, as the mill will open on that date after a two months shutting down. The high price of cotton was the cause of closing the mill.

Many other items could be given of the same nature covering every month of the last few years. In view of that unfortunate state of affairs in the cotton trade, it is unlikely that even the most audacious high protectionists will lay at the doors of the Democratic Party any responsibility for the depression.

Just about this time of the year it is the custom in cotton manufacturing to shut down the plants. They shut them down sometimes for a few days, sometimes for a few weeks. They do it partly to curtail production and keep prices up, and partly to overhaul the machinery that is in their mills. There are other parts of the country to-day where the cotton mills are suffering from a genuine depression, but there is no single one of those manufacturers who will honestly maintain that the fear of Democratic tariff revision has made idle the spindles in their mills. The spindles in Europe are idle. The spindles in Canada are idle. The spindles in many of our southern cotton mills are idle, because, as we read in the morning papers of to-day, there has been a great drought on the Catawba River, which took away the motor power of the mills in North and South Carolina and caused them to shut down for lack of power. Is that Democratic tariff revision?

However, to offset that, the morning papers also announced that all through New England a general reopening of the mills, textile and otherwise, is now under way. Many of them reopened yesterday, and many more are to come. [Applause.]

To every self-respecting American it must have caused a feeling of disgust to learn from Republican orators of recent years of our helpless incapacity in all lines of business. According to them there has been nothing that any American could do as well as a foreigner. All lines of trade and manufacturing could not survive any competition from abroad. Whatever prosperity we had came from making our taxes higher, and no American could retain his employment for a moment if a foreign article was sold in competition with that which he produced. And through all this chorus of hypocritical pretense their chief concern has been for the wages of the laboring man. Even now certain cotton manufacturers are announcing that under our bill they must shut down their plants and throw their labor out of employment because they can not afford to operate with 0.53 of 1 per cent of additional competition from abroad. It is the old legacy that we received from the Wilson tariff law. I think the greatest curse that came to the American people as a result of the hard times in 1892 and 1893 was the refastening upon our neck of the yoke of a high protective tariff. In those days of depression, when men in all lines of business were suffering from causes already in operation long before the passage of the Wilson Act, the high-protected manufacturer of the McKinley law came to the front and asserted that it was the fault of the Wilson tariff, and succeeded in persuading enough voters that that was the cause of their hardships, so that they were able to refasten on our necks the tariff burden which we have ever since endured. The workingman has believed this. He has believed his wages came out of the tariff. He has voted for a high protection every four years. If he had not so voted, it is not possible that the manufacturers could have succeeded in prolonging their long lease of high protection beyond the term of its natural life. But it does seem to-day that the workingman of the country is beginning to realize that he is the chief sufferer from a high tariff protective system, that to tax him higher is not to make him more prosperous, and that a tariff system that takes his wages out of his pockets does not make him any richer; that he has to buy as many of the commodities of life as the rich man, and that therefore the tariff bears more heavily upon him than the man of unlimited income.

But our Republican friends across the aisle have asserted day after day, and some of the manufacturers are now asserting in the public prints, that the first effect of the Democratic bill will be to put down wages, that they can not operate and pay these magnificent American wages to the employees of the cotton mills if the present Underwood bill becomes a law. That opens up

one of the most extraordinary instances of political buncombe with which the American people have ever been deluded. An examination of the condition of the cotton-manufacturing industry in New England discloses one fact more luminous in that record than all others in the history of manufacturing. It establishes beyond peradventure of a doubt just exactly where the tariff plunder goes. It does not go to the American workman, but it goes in dividends to the highly protected manufacturers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] According to the twenty-second report of the industrial statistics of Rhode Island, the average weekly earnings in cotton-goods mills vary from \$7 to \$8 a week. How is that for a magnificent American wage! For 12,000 men employed the average wage is from \$8 to \$9, and for women it is \$6 to \$7, and for children \$3 to \$4.

There are 53,000 persons employed in Rhode Island in the manufacture of textiles, and 72 per cent of the working children of Rhode Island are in the textile mills. In New Hampshire the story is almost the same; in the manufacture of cotton cloth the average number of male employees is 12,167; the average number of females 12,901. The average wage of the male is \$11.67; the average wage of the female \$8.11 per week; and there are 330 children under 16 who are employed at an average of \$5.27 a week. In the manufacture of cotton yarn in New Hampshire the general average is somewhat lower than cotton cloth, being only \$7.52 instead of \$9.01 for cotton cloth.

In Maine in 1906 the average number of males employed was 5,323; females, 6,400; children under 16 years of age, 590; making a general average of \$6.27. Now, we heard the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] on yesterday describe how the working people of England were coming to our country in great numbers to take advantage of the magnificent wages which American workmen receive at the hands of a high protective tariff, but if he would examine the figures which are reported, he would see that the average wages paid in the cotton mills of England per week is \$6.37, actually higher in free-trade England, with her pauper labor, about which we have heard so much, than the American workman receives in the highly-protected State of Maine. In Massachusetts the weekly wage now averages in the vicinity of \$9. Now, what is the result of the payment of these miserable, starvation wages in the cotton mills of the United States? The result is inevitable—that a wage of \$8 or \$9 a week is not a living wage, and that the husband and father takes his wife and children into the mills to eke out his miserable existence. The immediate result of it all is a system of industrial slavery which excites the commiseration of all benevolent people throughout our country. High infant mortality inevitably follows. I do not desire to dwell on these unhappy conditions, and I refer to them only to answer the preposterous and hypocritical pretense of the Republicans that a high protective tariff gives these workmen in the textile mills their share of protection; that their wages are raised by a high protective tariff. Of course, if the manufacturers had been willing to give their share to the operatives in the New England mills, there would not have been such an outcry of discontent. But those people up there understand the situation. They are not going to be beguiled by statements such as we heard yesterday from the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. UTTER], describing the magnificent condition of the mill workers to-day.

I believe that if you could put in the hands of every workman in New England as he casts his ballot on election day a statement of the contrast between the wages that he receives and the dividends paid in the mills in which he is employed, every one of them would go into the booth and vote the Democratic ticket for the sole purpose of getting rid of this tariff incubus.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman explain why, if conditions in this country are as bad as he claims them to be, there is such a large number of foreign-born workmen constantly seeking admittance into the United States?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, the gentleman is too good an American not to know that those people come here because they want to live in a democracy and get out of a monarchy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, is not it true that most of them come here because they have a better opportunity to secure a better living by receiving a higher wage than they received on the other side?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has just listened to my statement that the operatives in the textile mills in England receive higher weekly wages than the operatives in the textile mills in Maine under all these years of high protection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I wish to ask the gentleman to listen to me, as I believe I am to follow him, when I present the figures showing that wages are about one-half as large in all the textile industries of England as they are in the United States.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman must be a necromancer if he produces those figures.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The figures can be found in the British Trade Report.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the fact is the wages paid in the cotton industry of the United States are lower than those paid in any other textile industry in our country. They are lower than those paid in the manufacture of woollens; they are lower than those paid in the manufacture of silk goods; and they are lower than those paid in the manufacture of jute and hemp goods.

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. BOWMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows the character of the work that the English mechanic is employed upon, and whether it is a higher class of work than that upon which the workmen in New England are employed?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think there are some employees in the English mills who do a higher grade of work, and the result is shown in the fact that England produces a higher grade of cotton goods, on the average, than the United States does.

During these recent highly protected years in New England mills the poorly organized employees have been fighting for a living wage. In Rhode Island in the cotton mills there were 12 strikes in 1901, 7 strikes in 1902, 10 strikes in 1903, 5 strikes in 1904, and 2 strikes in 1905. If the high tariff has been operating so beneficently as Messrs. Whitman, Lippitt, and McColl allege, why these strikes? And these strikes do not mark the only periods of discontent. Sometimes the mill owners are too quick for them. When the operatives hear by chance of the enormous profits of their employer and decide to demand a mere crumb more from his table, the owners many a time shut down the mills and cast their operatives out of employment. Hunger is a wonderful remedy for discontent.

The Report on Statistics of Labor in Massachusetts for 1907 says, at page 476:

The predominant cause of strikes, as measured by the number of disputes, was for increase in wages. This cause alone produced 38.29 per cent of the 1,003 strikes that occurred during the five-year period from 1903 to 1907.

And at page 481:

So far as the number of strikes is concerned, the leading industries were cotton goods, with 2,223, or 14.77 per cent, of all the strikers.

The whole matter may be summed up in the statement that the average wages per capita in the cotton industry are lower than in any of the textile trades in our country. The census of 1905 showed that the average wage in cotton manufactures was \$304.31 per annum; in wool manufactures, \$393.37; in silk and silk goods, \$336.28; in flax, hemp, and jute products, \$350.12; and in dyeing and finishing textiles, \$434.96.

Look on that picture, then on this. Consider the effect of high protection on the industry which pays the lowest wages. Look well and you may see distinctly where all the tariff plunder has gone. The question may be excellently understood from the dividend returns of New England cotton mills in recent years.

The year 1908 was not a satisfactory one to the average stockholder in the United States. Although the panic started in 1907 its full effect was not felt until the following year. Thousands of corporations passed their dividends; many of the most prosperous were compelled to reduce their dividends. The cotton manufacturers in Massachusetts were remarkably prosperous at a time when other industries were facing either bankruptcy or curtailment in every possible direction. A review of the dividends paid by the cotton mills of Massachusetts in that year of depression is a fair illustration of the ability of that industry to weather any financial storm without disappointing the stockholders, who have grown accustomed to abnormal profits.

Take the Acushnet Mill, of New Bedford, for instance. Prior to 1907 that mill had been paying 16 per cent on a capitalization of \$1,000,000. In the panic year a dividend of 66 per cent was paid. In 1908, when other industries were passing dividends, the Acushnet was able to pay its normal rate of 16 per cent. That it might have paid a much higher rate is indicated by the fact that last year it declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent.

A more striking illustration is to be found in the financial history of Dartmouth mill, also of New Bedford. This mill had been paying dividends ranging from 8 per cent to 26 per cent. In the panic year, the dividend jumped to 66 per cent.

The year in which the panic actually started, and the year in which the depression was felt most, had no effect whatever on the Dartmouth mills. In 1908, the year of depression, the Dartmouth stockholders were again given a 66 per cent dividend. But this does not begin to tell the wonderful story of cotton-mill prosperity. One would suppose that stockholders and directors who had been paid 66 per cent on their investment in a year when their neighbors received nothing from their investments in other industries, would feel contented. Sixty-six per cent did not satisfy the Dartmouth people, however. The Christmas holidays of 1908 came around and on Christmas eve the board of directors of the Dartmouth mills assembled in the board room to see what they could do to make their stockholders happy when they awoke on Christmas morning. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They glanced at the profits for the year, concluded that a 66 per cent cash dividend was totally inadequate to compensate their stockholders for risking their money in such a hazardous industry and thereupon declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent.

It is a curious coincidence that during 1908 in Massachusetts the wages were reduced to \$3,403 employees of cotton mills, the total reduction aggregating \$89,972.78 a week.

Even the 100 per cent Christmas present to the Dartmouth cotton barons does not tell the whole story. The cotton schedule in the Payne-Aldrich bill had increased the duties on the fine cotton goods manufactured in the Dartmouth mills. With these prohibitive duties in effect there was more business ahead than could be cared for by the equipment then being operated. The directors therefore decided to build another mill, to install the machinery necessary to manufacture the finer grades of cotton goods on which the rates had been increased. These improvements were to cost approximately \$3,000,000. The entire cost was paid out of the surplus, after dividends of 66 per cent had been paid in two preceding years, and after a stock dividend of 100 per cent had been declared. After this enormous outlay of cash had been made for dividends and improvements, the Dartmouth mills were able to pay 13 per cent on their doubled capitalization in 1909 and 16 per cent in 1910.

The policy of declaring big stock dividends is not peculiar to the Dartmouth corporation. It was done by other mills before the panic, during the panic, and since the panic. Here are a few illustrations:

The Butler Mills, of New Bedford, declared a stock dividend of 20 per cent in 1910, and goes right on paying approximately the same rate of dividend which was paid before the increase in capitalization.

A 20 per cent stock dividend was paid in 1909 by the Pierce Mill of New Bedford. The dividend rate before the company made this gift to its stockholders was 8 per cent. The company continues to pay 8 per cent on the stock for which it was paid and on the stock which it gave away.

The Whitman cotton mills in New Bedford pays its dividends regularly, and following the custom in that city, occasionally makes its stockholders a present. This mill paid a cash dividend of 33½ per cent in 1909. This particular mill is worthy of more than passing attention. It is owned by William Whitman, who has boasted that he has helped make every Republican tariff bill for more than 40 years. Whitman is the man who has repeatedly warned Congress that a reduction of duties in the cotton and woolen mills would paralyze these industries. Mr. Whitman's activities in the making of tariff schedules have been remunerative, which fact is illustrated in his payment of a cash dividend by his cotton mill in 1909 of 33½ per cent.

The Kilburn Mill, of New Bedford, is another corporation which has found it possible to make handsome presents to its stockholders without disturbing its regular dividend rate. This mill made a 100 per cent increase in its stock in 1910; in the same year it declared a cash dividend of 33½ per cent, and it goes right on paying its 6 per cent dividend.

While the New Bedford cotton-mill corporations are notorious for their enormous profits, the Fall River mills, making a lower grade of cotton goods, are not far behind.

The Bourne Mill paid a stock dividend of 40 per cent in 1903.

The Chace Mills paid a stock dividend of 20 per cent in 1905, a stock dividend of 33½ per cent in 1907, and despite this increase of 50 per cent in its capitalization for which it received no money, it is paying a higher rate of interest on its stock to-day than it did before the stock was presented to the stockholders.

The Davis Mill was paying 6 per cent to its stockholders for a number of years. In 1909 the company declared a stock dividend of 25 per cent. Apparently this increase in capitalization had not the slightest effect on the earning capacity of the Davis Mill, for the same rate of dividend has been since maintained.

The same situation prevails in the Davol Mills. This mill had been paying 6 per cent. In 1907, the panic year, a stock dividend of 25 per cent was declared without affecting the rate of the dividends in the succeeding years.

The King Phillip Mill is another which had been paying 6 per cent. Manifestly this rate did not represent the real earnings of this corporation, for in 1906 the stockholders were given an opportunity to take a stock dividend of 50 per cent or a cash dividend of the same amount. This did not disturb the dividend rate.

The Laurel Lake Mills were more generous. In 1907, the panic year mind you, a stock dividend of 100 per cent was declared, and on the doubled capitalization the mills are now paying 8 per cent, 3½ per cent more than in 1905 and 1906, two years generally recognized in the cotton trade as normal years.

Another evidence of the prosperity of the Fall River mills in the panic year is to be found in the Merchants Mills. In that year, 1907, the Merchants declared a stock dividend of 50 per cent. In the following year its dividends were 6 per cent on the increased capitalization, 1½ per cent greater than in 1907 and 2 per cent greater than in 1906, a normal year, and 4 per cent greater than in 1905, also a normal year in the cotton trade.

The Pocasset Mills furnish another illustration of the fact that the cotton-manufacturing industry is immune from panics. In 1907, a year of distress in other branches of business, the Pocasset declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent. The doubled capitalization caused no fluctuation in the dividends, for the corporation has gone right on paying 6 per cent, just as it did for years before the stockholders were allowed to double their holdings without the expenditure of a penny. It is reasonable to expect that the monotony of these 6 per cent dividends will be broken in the near future by another stock dividend.

The year 1907 was a happy one also for the stockholders in the Richard Borden Mills. In that year there was a stock dividend of 25 per cent. On this increased capitalization the mills are now paying 10 per cent, which is 4½ per cent greater than the dividend rates in the normal years of 1905 and 1906.

In 1906 the Tecumseh Mills paid a stock dividend of 50 per cent. Several times since the capitalization was increased the dividends have exceeded those prior to the date of the increased capitalization, and at no time has it gone below the rates paid prior to 1906.

The Troy mills varied the monotony of cash and stock dividends by presenting their stockholders with a bond dividend of 100 per cent in 1909. This enables them to continue paying from 12 to 67 per cent on its \$300,000 of common stock.

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina. Has the gentleman any information of the market value of the stock in those mills?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman asks me for the market value of the stock in those mills. I have the figures here which will answer that question precisely, but I can say in general terms that the market value of almost all the New England mills is above par, and in many cases a premium of 200 or 300 or 400 per cent.

Now, of course, the gold mine that the New England manufacturers have discovered in the tariff probably does not seem to them excessive. We had some testimony before the Ways and Means Committee during the Payne-Aldrich revision which gave an illuminating impression to the people of this country as to just what New Englanders did expect to make out of the tariff. I quote from the printed hearings of the committee—

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. DICKINSON. I notice that you have been reading about the large profits to the New England manufacturers in 1908 and other years. It has frequently been stated here in this Chamber that there is a great depression now in the cotton industry, and particularly among the southern cotton mills. Can you state to the House what is the cause of that depression and the reason for no profits coming now, when they did come two years ago, if that be the fact? Is there a real depression and no profit, or is it due, in part, to the increased price in cotton? Or what are the real facts, and what is your explanation?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that so far as the southern mills are concerned, and some of the northern mills, I believe that the depression now existing is in large part due to the high price of cotton. But the southern mills, in addition, as I stated a few minutes ago, are suffering from a momentary loss of their motive power. They are also suffering from a partial loss of their oriental market. Now, mark you, I do not mean to say

that our cotton goods exports have gone off because we do not sell as many goods in China as before. Our general exports of cotton goods have increased, but we do not sell as many goods in China as we did.

Mr. DICKINSON. May I inquire further of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. DICKINSON. I understand, and I am informed, that there is a great demand for, and difficulty among the manufacturing establishments to get, at this time, sufficient raw cotton to meet demands of the industry. Is not the present condition of depression which exists, both in the South and in New England, due to the fact that there has been overproduction?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think unquestionably.

Mr. DICKINSON. And that there is not sufficient market to make a demand for their goods?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think the gentleman is unquestionably right, and I think that contains an expensive lesson for the American manufacturers. If they would only consider the effect of the high protective tariff on their trade relations with the rest of the world, they would see that England, that has twice as many cotton spindles as the United States, is catering to a market of perhaps 900,000,000 people and American cotton manufacturers are catering to a home market of only one-tenth as many people, although their export trade has begun to improve. Now, they can not go out to the world's markets with a piece of cotton goods in one hand and a club in the other hand and expect to do business with other peoples. But the ultimate improvement in the cotton trade is to be looked for in our export trade. Our manufacturers have got the home market and they have overcapitalized and overproduced, and they have given our home market about all it could absorb since the time of depression in 1908.

Mr. DICKINSON. Just one other question, if I may be permitted.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. DICKINSON. Do I understand the gentleman to say or mean that if we had freer trade and more active commerce with all nations those industries are liable to revive, instead of suffer continued depression?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Unquestionably; and American labor will be better employed and American wages will be higher in the cotton mills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have just two more matters which I wish to touch on briefly. I have been describing to the committee the state of affairs in the Dartmouth mill, where in the years of depression—in 1908, for example—they paid 166 per cent in dividends; and I would like to have the committee consider whether this Tariff Board, which is expected to bring relief to the American people, in endeavoring to ascertain the difference in cost of production here and abroad, and a reasonable profit, as the Republican platform demands, is going to adopt New England standards and to follow the advice of the Republican tariff prophets, Mr. HENRY F. LIPPITT and James R. McColl, who wrote these tariff rates. Here is a little colloquy that occurred before the Committee on Ways and Means in the last revision, when Mr. LIPPITT appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. I read from page 4535:

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not know whether I understood Mr. LIPPITT correctly to say that no large fortunes have ever been made in this business in New England?

Mr. LIPPITT. I think so.

Mr. LONGWORTH. My impression is that most of the large New England fortunes have been made in it.

Mr. LIPPITT. We are not accustomed to very large fortunes in New England.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, may I ask you what you call a large fortune?

Mr. LIPPITT. I would regard a fortune of three-quarters of a billion as a large fortune.

Mr. McCALL. You mean there are no manufacturers of very great wealth in New England?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes; I mean to say if you compare the cotton industry with others.

There, Mr. Chairman, is where the "reasonable profit" goes. There is where the benefits of the high protective tariff go. They do not go to the workingmen. Do you suppose that the men employed in Mr. LIPPITT's cotton mill at \$6, \$7, or \$8 a week would share his opinion that it takes three-quarters of a billion dollars to make a large fortune?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In deference to the gentleman, I yield to myself five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes additional.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, out of consideration for the feelings of the committee I will not detain them further than to make a few closing observations.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman repeat the figures he gave as being Mr. LIPPITT's estimate of a large fortune?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it possible for any one man to have three-quarters of a billion dollars?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. LIPPITT evidently believed that if he could get the tariff up on cotton he could get that much. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman does he believe that Mr. LIPPITT has any such amount of money, or that it would be possible for Mr. LIPPITT to have any such amount of money in his own possession?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; but he is looking for it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit me one more question: Is it possible for any man in this country or any other country to have in his possession so large an amount of money, taken away from the public, by whom it would be used in labor and in other industrial purposes?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I suppose that Mr. LIPPITT had in mind the extraordinary fortune that Mr. Carnegie made out of the tariff on steel, but his purpose was to get the cotton rates up so that he could equal Mr. Carnegie, and he pretty nearly succeeded.

Mr. UTTER. In all good faith I should like to ask the gentleman from New York if, after reading the hearing from which he has read, he took the answer of Mr. LIPPITT in a serious way?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I was very much alarmed when I heard that he proposed to mulct the American people in three-quarters of a billion dollars if he got the rate that he asked for.

Mr. UTTER. I am glad to have the gentleman say that, because it strikes me that very many other statements have been taken in the same way, and things said as a joke have been taken in all seriousness.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In view of the stupendous dividends of which I have given you a brief idea, Messrs. LIPPITT and McColl came down here to get the tariff rates on manufactured cotton goods raised. Mr. LIPPITT stated to the Ways and Means Committee that the industry was not a bonanza, but he said it is one of narrow margins and that success in it can only be obtained by most careful management. Now, the most careful management that these extraordinary men in New England have been exercising has been yielding them 100 or 200 per cent dividends for some years, but they were only able to pay the labor in their mills \$5, \$6, and \$7 a week. These men have perfectly solved the riddle of how to get something for nothing, and I do not wonder that they are not willing to let go of it. These are the corporations which tremble at the threat of tariff reduction. Swollen with tariff profits, they are unwilling to leave the banquet table.

Had their marvelous achievements at money making been conducted on an economically honest basis, all Americans would approve. Had they not the stigma of paying the lowest wages of any of the textile trades, all men would bid them Godspeed. But when, rich beyond the flights of the most eager imagination, loaded down with tariff plunder taken from all Americans, rich and poor alike, built up with the sweat and toil of underpaid employees, they announce that tariff reduction means reduction in wages, all Americans must cry them down in shame. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to my colleague from New York [Mr. REDFIELD].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If the gentleman from Kansas will excuse me, I think the committee would prefer to hear from my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. REDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on the way from India to this extra session, and while crossing the Arabian Sea, I strolled one afternoon to the afterpart of the ship to a little shop in which the steamship company allows certain small articles to be sold. The vessel was one belonging to the Peninsula & Oriental Steam Navigation Co. I need only mention the name of this famous line to have you know that it is a peculiarly British line. It is heavily subsidized by the English Government, and is also under contract with the Australian Government and the Government of India. It is the British steamship company par excellence of this world.

There in the little shop at the afterpart of the ship were sold some very attractive small clocks—little travelers' clocks. I call your attention to the fact that they were the "Line" clock; they bore on their face the English flag beautifully intertwined with the flag of the steamship company. I bought one of the clocks and took it with me to my stateroom and showed it to my wife, and in my enthusiasm took it out of its case and discovered on it an inscription I had not theretofore seen: "Made in Connecticut, U. S. A." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss to-day some salient features of three public statements, viz, a pamphlet, "Wool Manufacture in America and Europe," sent each Member of this House by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers; an address before this House on June 17 by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. AMES; papers sent with the message of the President of the United States, dated May 17, 1911, Senate document 31; and with these some letters from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers to me. Before doing so it is well to suggest certain principles and to make certain facts and their relations clear. And in using figures I recall that in a New England city, famous for its municipal statistics, appeared the statement that 300 per cent of its Turkish population was criminal. A student, whose attention this fact aroused, investigated it and found that the Turkish population consisted of one Turk who had been locked up three times. In studying manufacturing costs it is necessary to go behind the returns.

Let us stand before a great factory and think who are interested in it. At the office door enters the man in control. Often he is not the owner, but one among many owners chosen to act in their behalf. In a true sense he is a trustee for those whose money made the mill. Upon its success his livelihood and their profits depend. Among these owners often are women and children. Their capital is at risk and is largely locked up in buildings, machinery, and material. The proportion of their assets that is liquid is small. The demand for dividends is imperative. The risk is large. The men who run that mill and by their skill, wisdom, and experience provide employment for workers and profit for owners should be well paid. The owners, because their property is tied up in assets not easily convertible and at a serious business risk, are entitled to more return than would be the case were the money invested in prime securities quickly turned into cash or secured by mortgages and subject to less risk. Money in a textile or paper mill should therefore earn more than in Government or State or city bonds or in quickly convertible stocks. It is natural that those whose money is so invested should shrink from any change in their conditions. This alone accounts for much of the opposition to tariff changes.

At the large mill gate enters the throng of workers. What they use in that mill is often not their own. They, in a sense, are trustees for the use of materials and machinery belonging to others. Their property is not at risk, but their living is. So far as livelihood is concerned, they have at stake what the mill manager has at stake. Upon their faithful doing of the daily task the owners' profit depends. Upon the wisdom and strength of the management the homes, the comfort, the health, perhaps the lives of the workers depend. The mill is the common ground. It should be the servant of them all; often it is the master. As the money of the owners is at risk in the mill, so the homes of the workers are at risk, and the margin of safety for those homes and families is less for the worker than for the manager and for the owners. As the business risk of the owners should have consideration, so the home risk of the worker is entitled to care.

Without the mill, distant perhaps from it, is the third and the greater party in interest, the public—the people who buy the goods that are made there. Out of the great mill gate go cars of goods to this public and those consumers of the mill's product are interested in the design, the quality, the cheapness of those goods and in the promptness and regularity with which they are supplied. The right of the consumer to standard goods at a reasonable price is real and must be considered. [Applause.]

In Soerabaya, Java, I saw dredging and filling done in a strange way. Naked men with small baskets dived from boats in midstream, scraping the sandy mud from the bottom in these baskets, from which they loaded the boats. These then were rowed ashore and again with baskets the mud was dumped upon the marshy spots where the building was to be erected. When a suction dredge is substituted for such a crude process all parties gain, the owner of the dredge, the workers on the dredge, and the customer for the dredge. The owner receives more, the worker is paid more, and the cost is less.

Whether they will or not, these three parties in interest in that mill can not be separated. They are united by bands not less strong that they are unseen, nor less potent that at times one or another of these parties seek to break or ignore them.

A mill will not permanently prosper if the owner seeks his profit at the expense of the worker, whether it be the expense of the worker's pocket or health or brains, nor will it long prosper if the owners seek profits without regard to the consumer, nor will the worker or consumer profit long if the goods are sold more cheaply than they can be made. Loss to the mill owner means, ultimately, loss to the mill worker and loss to the consumer, too. Nor will the worker long profit if, thinking of himself alone, he demands an undue share, more than can justly be had, of what that mill produces. These three must get along together. How can it best be done?

It should be clear, Mr. Chairman, from what has been said that the thoughts to be presented are offered in no partisan or destructive spirit. The Democratic Party has been charged with being a destroyer of our industries, of being heedless alike of their right to earn profits and their duty to pay righteous wages. Perhaps we may charge our opponents with insufficient care for the interest of the consuming public in our industries, but above and beyond political and financial considerations rises the human interest in our theme, for we deal with the homes and lives of men. If into dark places light may come, if for penury plenty may be had, if for sickness we may have health, if for anxiety we may substitute peace, surely it is worth doing. Not, indeed, that we may do these things all at once, but rather open the way so that as time passes the clearer light of a better day may dawn. Can we translate into terms of human happiness the laws of business and of taxation? No less than this is what needs doing, and is what we seek to begin to do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In a recent book I read:

What workmen want from their employers beyond anything else is high wages, and what employers want from their workmen most of all is a low labor cost of manufacture. These two conditions are not opposed to one another, as would appear at first glance. On the contrary, they can be made to go together in all classes of work without exception.

The writer proceeds to say that he speaks—
with the object of advocating high wages and low labor cost as the foundation of the best management.

A prominent manufacturer states—
to insure the best results the organization of productive labor must be direct and controlled by persons having not only executive ability and possessing the practical familiarity of a mechanic or engineer with the goods produced and the processes employed, but having also an equally practical knowledge of how to observe, record, analyze, and compare essential facts in relation to wages, supplies, expense accounts, and all else that enters into or affects the economy of production and the cost of the product.

Another American manufacturer in a different line says:

The American manufacturer to be successful must be an economist, know exact costs, and have the courage to abandon slipshod ways of product.

A third manufacturer in still another line says:

When the time comes, and I think its approach is near, that as much thought and study and as big brains are devoted to the problem of labor as have heretofore been devoted to and absorbed by the problems of financing, selling, and equipment, when we study the man behind the machine as closely as we do the machine, we shall see ways of making the one fit the other more closely than we do now.

All about great mills are instruments regulating machinery, providing that machines are not overstrained, that their product shall be within their power regularly to produce without damage to the machine; we even care lest machines get overheated and, in a true sense, lest they get overtired, for we know that a tired machine gives out and its life is not as long as it should be, and its product neither as large nor as good as it ought to be. We protect it against dust, we lubricate it, we even let it rest, yet that machine is dead and of itself inert. When shall we learn that to be most productive a living and responsive man needs also not to be overtired or overstrained, that he needs rest, that his product shall be always within and not beyond his power? Until the course we take with our machinery is recognized as of equal application to our men and women workers we shall not have solved the problem of production. So long as we extract from men and women the most possible for the least return to them we are working against the deepest laws of nature and of finance, our sight is short, we are but blind leaders of the blind. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The normal resistance of a working force to pressure under conditions of a narrow wage and long hours is not an element that leads to profit.

And here once for all let me say that believing strongly in scientific management, no management is scientific or sound which promotes or permits human overstrain or which taxes the future of women and children to make profits.

In a former address it was stated as a principle of production that high wages, combined with the best equipment of machinery and tools, with the best factory conditions, and the best management, means always low labor cost per unit of prod-

uct, and also that a diminishing cost per unit of product was not inconsistent with but was normal to an increasing rate of wage, provided the conditions of modern equipment and tools, good working conditions, and proper management were had. These laws apply to every industry; it can never be claimed respecting general laws that they are of limited application. Human nature is the same force in a paper mill as in an army; antagonism to injustice, resistance to narrow conditions, righteous desire for a living wage, are the same in the factory, the family, and the mine. It was written of old, "A house divided against itself shall not stand." It is the commonplace of every baseball field that teamwork wins. If we establish the law of the increasing wage and the diminishing labor cost, when conditions are as they ought to be, then we shall see the beginning of the end of the sweatshop and of child labor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the line of argument which the gentleman is making, and I would like, for further information, to have him elucidate this problem. A month ago I was in a mill connected with the cotton industry, and I saw a woman who four months ago was winding bobbins in Dresden, Germany. She got 12 marks a week. I saw her winding bobbins on the same machine, running at the same speed, getting \$12 a week, or a little over four times as much. Right alongside of her I saw 26 looms. The weavers were from Nottingham. The machines were from Nottingham. The men six months ago were running the same machines in Nottingham at the same speed, getting \$12.50 a week, and I saw them getting \$30 to \$32 a week. Now, how can there be an equal cost?

Mr. REDFIELD. I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman has asked that question—

Mr. HILL. And I ask the question in good faith, in view of the gentleman's large experience.

Mr. REDFIELD. And I will answer it in good faith by saying at once that a large lace manufacturer in Nottingham, England, told me on the 2d or 3d day of May that if we would take off our tariff bars that would drive him out of business. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman mean that we could do it paying the same wages?

Mr. REDFIELD. Pardon me. I will not listen to the gentleman until he will give me a chance to answer his question. The answer to the first half of the gentleman's question is that if the manufacturer who was employing the woman at a higher wage knew his business and had his proper management his goods would have cost him less at the higher wage than more, and if you will pardon me I will give you testimony in a very short time of one of your former Republican Members, himself a large cotton manufacturer.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me just one word?

Mr. REDFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. It was the identical same management in Connecticut owned by the same people that are operating the mill in Germany.

Mr. REDFIELD. I am very sorry to hear it. It should have been very much better. [Laughter.] And right there I will say without any question of hesitation that a large number of your textile mills keep no costs at all. They do not know what their goods cost them now, and I will give you an example, if you will be a little patient with me, of what scientific management did in one case, and I will be very much pleased to do it.

Mr. HILL. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. REDFIELD. No; I must go on with my argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. REDFIELD. It is perhaps right to add something respecting low labor cost per unit resulting from a higher wage under better conditions. No one questions that within the last 50 years, taken as a whole, the rate of wages paid in our industries advanced; yet if the total wages paid are compared with the total product in all our industries, it is found that whereas in the year 1860 the proportion of wages to product was 20.1 per cent, in 1905 the proportion of wages to product was but 18.4 per cent. Think you this a small difference? If the labor ratio in cost in 1860 had been maintained in 1905, our total manufactures that year would have cost two hundred and eighty million more than they did. It means also that while the wage itself has gone upward the labor cost of product has gone downward, for in this very period 1860-1905 wages advanced 69.5 per cent, but product grew 132.3 per cent. This is true also of the woolen industry. The ratio of total wages and salaries to total productions in 1889 was 20.6 per cent; in 1904, 19.8 per cent; and the ratio of the same factors

to one another in 1909 was 18.8 per cent. I am not discussing now what the actual cost is, but merely showing the downward course of labor cost side by side with the upward course of wages, and I take an extended period of years in order to get a true average.

Said the superintendent of a southern cotton mill to his employer only a few months ago—and the employer told me—"Boss," said he, "I have cut down my labor cost." "How much did you reduce the cost of wages?" said the man. "Nothing," he said, "I added to them, but I got more work." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In a letter to me of June 23 the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. says that while the item of wages for locomotive-engine men and firemen per mile run shows for 1910 9.52 cents as compared with 4.38 cents in 1860, the tractive power of their locomotives in freight service to-day is almost exactly four times that of 1860, and the other locomotives have increased in power somewhat in proportion, hence it is easy to see that while the wage element is a little more than double per mile run, the work done is four times, and therefore the labor cost per unit of work done per ton-mile or per passenger mile is about one-half to-day, despite the increased wage, because conditions exist which brings the law of highly paid labor making low labor cost into operation.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. REDFIELD. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to get the source of the gentleman's information. Was that information contained in the letter from the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad? I do not question it at all, but—

Mr. REDFIELD. Yes [tendering the original letter].

Mr. NORRIS. I did not know whether it was the language read from the letter of the president or whether that was the gentleman's own statement of the language of the letter.

Mr. REDFIELD. The statement was made by him, and I drew the deduction that four times the work done at twice the cost is one-half.

Perhaps one may pause here to state certain further facts respecting the proportion of the labor cost to the total cost of production which appears in statistics recently collected. It is important in all this discussion to keep in mind that in discussing labor cost we are dealing not with a major but a minor factor in production.

I have already shown that in our total manufactures in 1905 wages form not over 18.4 per cent of the total value, and in the woolen industry wages and salaries form 18.8 per cent of the value of production in 1909. This is confirmed by the report of the United States Steel Corporation for 1905, showing a total expenditure for wages and salaries of 22½ per cent of their product. The wage cost of the product of the manufacturers of this country did not in 1905 exceed 20 per cent of the value of that product. These figures do not show the actual cost of production or the ratio of wages to that cost, as I have said, merely the ratio of wages to the value of product. Mr. Forstmann, to whose pamphlet I refer, told me, however, that in his worsted mills the labor cost was 25 per cent of the total cost. I have been furnished cost sheets from a large tin-plate plant which show a labor cost of \$124 out of a total of \$957, or 13 per cent of the total factory cost. Page 27 of Senate Document No. 31, the Tariff Board report on pulp and news-print paper industry, gives some facts on this point, also chiefly remarkable, however, for the variations of cost which I have already shown to this House to be usual and ordinary.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. REDFIELD. In a few moments.

That report shows labor cost to be sometimes as low as 10 per cent of the total cost. The Boston News Bureau for July 4, 1911, says:

On cotton yarns, for example, raw materials cost is 19 cents; cost of manufacturing, 4 cents; and selling charges, 1 cent; making total net cost of 24 cents. This proportion of material is excessive, because of high price of cotton; but the small amount of labor cost is to be noted.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's opinion as to what bearing the labor cost to the manufacturer has on the individual wage paid to the labor?

Mr. REDFIELD. The bearing the labor cost has on the individual wage is just this: That in proportion as equipment is modern, conditions good, and management wise, that high wages brings always a low labor cost, inevitably and always.

Mr. WEEKS. I asked that question because in making the opening statement the other day the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means used the argument that labor was not get-

ting a suitable reward because labor cost was decreasing. It seemed to me fallacious reasoning.

Mr. REDFIELD. I am not concerned with that statement.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. REDFIELD. I think I do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. REDFIELD. When I have finished my statement.

Mr. HILL. It is right on that point.

Mr. REDFIELD. Returning again to the facts illustrating the law of high wages and low labor cost per unit under proper conditions, the records of our railways are significant because through the sworn data of the Interstate Commerce Commission exact comparisons can be made with foreign costs which are in this great industry available.

Between 1889 and 1909 the wages of all kinds of labor and the prices of most commodities used by the railways and their taxes as well increased. Yet 27 per cent more service was rendered by the railways per dollar of earnings to the public in 1909 than in 1889, and 66 per cent more service per dollar of capitalization. Every dollar of capital invested in American railways rendered four and a half times as much as in Great Britain, three times as much as in France, two and a quarter times as much as in Switzerland, and one and a half times as much as in Germany. For every dollar of net earnings the railways of the United States rendered two and a half times as much service to our public as did those of the United Kingdom and twice as much as did those of France, and, as compared with the Swiss and German railways, those of the United States rendered from one and a quarter to one and a half times as much service to the public. In other words, paying much higher wages in this country than elsewhere the cost per unit of product which, in the case of railways, is ton-miles, is vastly less than is the cost for like services in any European country, whether under private or State management. A railway company manufactures ton-miles. Those are its units of product, and here and now they are with higher wages but with modern methods more than meeting the competition of foreigners in producing the same goods, and their low cost per unit of product has been worked out simultaneously with an increasing average rate of wage.

Mr. HILL. Right on that point. How will the gentleman explain this fact, that piecework, identical with that on the other side—and much of our manufacturing processes are being carried on by piecework—the piecework wages are from two and a half to four times as high in the United States on identically the same proposition. How does the efficiency of labor and the high wage affect the output under such circumstances where the work and the whole industry is carried on by piecework?

Mr. REDFIELD. The gentleman has opened up a very large subject. It is impossible to answer that question in a—

Mr. HILL. Just a moment—if the gentleman will pardon me, because I know he can have all the time he wants and I think gentlemen want to have this question elucidated and the gentleman is perfectly capable of doing it—I have in my office in the office building the trade-union agreement in England with manufacturers in a certain line of industry, signed and sealed by both parties, so there is no question about the rates of wages that are paid. It is an industry which is done entirely by piecework, a work that is done in the United States, in England, and in Germany by piecework, and those prices are from two and a half to four times as high in Dedham, England, as they are in the United States.

Mr. REDFIELD. You mean the reverse, do you not?

Mr. HILL. Yes. How will the gentleman explain the equal cost in the first place?

Mr. REDFIELD. In the first place, the manufacturer who carried on his business that way did not know it. No one could tell what the limiting conditions are, because that would be limited by its machinery, power, space, and a hundred elements that you can not describe offhand. But I have made goods in America by piecework for years and have sold them in Birmingham and Berlin against English and German competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I can cite a case in the very business the gentleman is engaged in.

Mr. REDFIELD. I am glad you can, but you will do it in your time and not in mine. I simply say this, that I took the order myself in Germany for sewing-machine parts to be finished up there by a German sewing-machine manufacturer, and made them in Brooklyn and shipped them to Germany right along. And I took occasion the other day to ask the concern, with which I severed my connection some time ago, how they were

doing in their export trade, and they said that they were doing better than ever. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I can not be responsible for the ignorance, bad location, and bad equipment of manufacturers. I am not dealing with that, nor do I favor a law which puts a premium upon those things because they look to Washington for their help. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us turn now to what the textile manufacturers say for themselves and see whither that leads us, for to use the words of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association in the Tariff Bulletin No. 2, dated June 24, 1911:

The effect of general agitation and discussion of the subject must be both wholesome and effective.

On June 22 the secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers mailed me the pamphlet written by Mr. Forstmann, to whom I have already referred, saying:

You will note that Mr. Forstmann gives specific figures, showing that the labor cost of production is considerably greater in this country than in Germany. Are you prepared to affirm out of your own knowledge of the textile industry that the factor of labor cost is no higher in this country than in Europe?

I replied in part:

Two statements made by Mr. Forstmann impress me. One is when he says that American textile machinery is inferior or unavailable. I had not supposed he would put it so strongly. If the facts are as he states them, it constitutes a serious handicap to the industry. It would seem to be mechanically backward.

I am also impressed by what Mr. Forstmann says about the poor quality of labor in American woolen industry. This, if true, is, so unlike labor conditions in other American industries as to arouse wonder. Why is it that after many decades of development there is no large supply of high-grade American labor in the woolen industry? Is it possibly because our woolen manufacturers have sought the cheap rather than the economical and have been looking for a low wage rate, supposing that meant low labor cost per unit of product?

I think Mr. Forstmann has made a serious indictment of our woolen industry, and that our woolen manufacturers are chargeable with having to remedy these defects or explain them away before they can rightly call upon the people of the United States to pay taxes to support them. Public opinion will not sustain stretching the protective theory to make it cover negligent or incompetent management. It forms no righteous part of the tariff law that it indemnifies errors of location, faults in equipment, or the lack of scientific management.

I asked him also to—

give a full and clear statement of the costs of labor in each of, say, 10 different woolen or worsted mills which keep accurate and continuing scientific costs of the labor, material, burden, and selling expenses as related to each process of manufacture. Let it appear what the actual cost per unit of product is for each of the four classes of cost named in each department of each of these mills. Your statement also should show these same items of unit cost at periods for two or three years, that the tendency of cost may appear. Costs should, of course, be taken on goods of the same kind and weight, and on like quantities of each.

I asked him also to—

state the cost in a like number of English or German mills making the same goods in the same weight and in like quantities and to reckon it the same way; that is, against the labor, material, burden, and selling costs as apportioned to the one operation of weaving in an American mill, place the same information respecting foreign mills. As against the like costs found to exist in the operation of spinning in an American mill, place the information from an English or German mill, in each case comparing like with like in kind, weight, quality, and quantity, and so proceed throughout the manufacturing process. Unless and until this is done there can be no comparison. A mere statement of estimated cost is as absurd for purposes of taxation as it is for purposes of economy.

I asked:

How many woolen and worsted mills keep an accurate and scientific statement of costs, continued from month to month, for unless such cost records exist no statement predicated on cost has serious value.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has found in his investigation that scientific management has made greater advances in Europe than it has in the United States?

Mr. REDFIELD. I believe not. I believe it has advanced more here than there.

Mr. WEEKS. I am quite in accord with the gentleman in regard to the benefit to be obtained from scientific management.

Mr. REDFIELD. That it is advancing here more rapidly than in Europe is my understanding.

I pointed out to him that—

textile manufacturers have combined in a thorough and continuous study of fire insurance, so that in 60 years the cost of it has been reduced 90 per cent, being in 1910 less than one-tenth of what it was in the decade 1850-1860. Has it ever occurred to the woolen and worsted industries to put a like searching and continuous study upon their costs of production, and if not, why not?

To this last question no answer was made.

His reply I summarize as follows:

At this very time the agents of the Tariff Board in Washington, with the active cooperation of many manufacturers, are securing full and clear statements of costs of production in representative American woolen and worsted mills. I can not give you these statements now, because they are not completed. They are particularly valuable because they are being made up according to a harmonious plan in every establishment. These memoranda are being drawn up for exact comparison with costs of production in English or German mills. European manu-

facturers have been exceedingly secretive about their labor costs, and we on this side have never been able to secure satisfactory statements from them. However, much of the information of this kind which we have lacked may now be forthcoming in the official reports of the Tariff Board.

A great many woolen and worsted mills keep an accurate statement of costs, but there is naturally a lack of uniformity among them as to methods. This question of costs has been receiving increased attention from woolen and worsted manufacturers in the past few years.

The wool manufacture, as you know, is a very complex industry, unlike many other industries in that under one roof are often carried on all the processes of preparation, beginning with the raw, unwashed wool and going up to the most costly finished fabrics. Manifestly it is very much more difficult to keep an exact record of costs in such an establishment than it is in a factory where virtually only one process is carried out. Nevertheless the woolen and worsted manufacturers have been alert to modern needs and have made great, satisfactory progress in this direction. The agents of the Tariff Board express their gratification with the completeness and precision of the information which the woolen and worsted mills are being able to furnish.

I know and rejoice in the achievements of some lines of American manufactures in the export trade. But you are doubtless aware of the fact that only a very small fraction of our total manufactured product is exported, and that many of our greatest industries have almost no share in export commerce at all. Our cotton-goods market abroad is very small and precarious, and there is practically no export of woolen goods, except small quantities of ready-made American clothes, and chiefly to Canada and Mexico, and sold there to young men and women who like to dress in the American style.

He attributes the relatively low wages to operatives in the wool manufacture to the special severity of English competition, and, referring me to Mr. Forstmann's comparative wage scale, says that American manufacturers are presumably paying all they can afford. He asserts that they have made the same careful study of their industry that others have made; and if they have not been able to develop an export trade, it is a fair assumption they have had to meet difficult conditions. He points out that some American textile machinery is used in Europe and suggests that the reason for the inferior development of our textile machinery may be due to the fact that the wool industry has been the special target of political attack, and that men of business have hesitated to pursue it on that account. He states that the wool men "believe with apparent good reason" that their management on the whole is the best in the world," and closes with a statement from a New York importer complimentary to our woolen manufacturers, but having nothing to do with their mechanical equipment or their factory management, and adds:

The Democratic attack upon American wool manufacture is being delivered against one of the most modern and efficient of our national industries.

He corrects a mistake in my letter to him as to the date when the wool schedules under the Wilson bill went into effect, and adds:

The list of industries in which a notable export trade has been built up is still a relatively brief one.

And mentions machine tools, agricultural implements, building hardware, railway material and equipment, sewing machines, kerosene oil, and musical instruments of a few kinds.

I have summarized this correspondence to bring its essential points before you. It is all available to any inquirer.

We may be able to judge the accuracy of all the statements made by what is said about export trade. Referring to the statement that our cotton-goods market abroad is small and precarious, I find our export shipments of cotton manufactures in the year ending June 30, 1911, were \$40,800,000, an increase of \$7,400,000 over the previous two years, or over 20 per cent, much larger than in 1908 and 1907, and exceeded only in substantial amount by the two years 1905 and 1906, prior to which time there were no years in which exports of cotton manufactures were as large as in 1911. Some days ago, watching a civic procession in New England, I saw a sign upon the float of a maker of paper-mill machinery, reading:

We make no noise, but our machinery is now running in all parts of the world—China, Japan, Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Germany, France, England, all over the United States of America and Canada.

The official statistics of the American Iron & Steel Association for the year 1909 showed exports of iron and steel products amounting to \$157,670,000, exceeding 1908 by \$6,500,000. Those for the year ending June 30, 1911, were nearly \$200,000,000, of which machinery forms a large part. Included in this item in 1909 were 13,800 stationary engines, 295 locomotives, 64 fire engines, 5,800 safes, 30,000 cash registers, 56,000 car wheels, 800 traction engines, and so forth.

I have a copy of the American Exporter in which are 174 pages occupied by advertisements of American manufacturers selling their goods abroad, and the publishers write:

Our service is an asset to 600 manufacturers, who use it to broaden their trade in other countries.

An editorial from *Printers' Ink* is so pertinent that I quote it:

What happens when American manufacturers with spunk stub their toes against a domestic setback and turn their eyes on foreign lines is illustrated by the automobile export record of the last few years. In 1908 only 2,477 cars were exported, whereas cars are at present moving outside of this country at the rate of 1,000 per month.

How can it be possible that this is true of England, France, and Germany, when they are large makers of automobiles and pay such low wages? [Applause.] But the statement of the Bureau of Statistics issued July 21 is conclusive on this matter. For the fiscal year just closed our exports increased \$304,000,000; of this increase manufactures were \$140,000,000. The bureau adds:

The increase in manufactures is apparent in a large number of articles. Agricultural implements as a whole show an increase of about \$8,000,000; mowers and reapers alone about \$5,000,000; plows and cultivators about two and one-half millions; iron and steel manufactures as a whole an increase of about \$47,000,000, while the details of iron and steel show for sheets and plates about \$4,000,000 increase; structural iron and steel about \$3,000,000; metal-working machinery about \$5,000,000; wire about \$2,000,000; electrical machinery about \$2,000,000; mining machinery nearly \$2,000,000; locomotives over a million; traction engines more than a million; automobiles show a gain of about \$3,000,000; railway cars about \$4,000,000; electrical appliances about \$2,000,000.

Of our total exports, manufactured goods form in all 44.16 per cent, being taken as a whole—the largest item of export. The next is "crude materials for use in manufacturing," which is 36.58 per cent. These two make 80 per cent of our exports, foodstuffs being 19 per cent. So recently as 1880 our exports of manufacture were but 15 per cent of all. They are three times that now and growing. Their aggregate amount in the year just ended was over \$827,000,000. Surely, how much our factories need protection. [Applause on the Republican side.] Against whom? Our own customers? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A house in New York specializes in wearing apparel and furnishing goods for men and women for export, including such lines for men as negligee and work shirts, neckwear, belts and suspenders, collars, underwear, hosiery, craps, and overalls, and for women, hats, skirts, blouses, petticoats, and so forth, with a line of children's dresses. The proprietor says he has been able to demonstrate to foreign buyers that the lines enumerated are the equals, if not the superiors, of any similar goods made in Europe, and "when opportunity has been had to submit prices orders have resulted in spite of the strongest kind of competition."

In the month of April I was dining with a man, who was an American and manager of some large English interests, at the Hotel Langham, London, and he told me a good joke upon himself. He is interested in some Chilean railways, and when the question of material and supplies for the road arose shortly he made a strong bid to get half of the goods to be bought in America, and he succeeded in this respect, that they got the equipment and the supplies bought in America, but the English people insisted that the rails should be bought in England, and he had to yield. He received a report from the receiving department in Chile, however, a few months later, to the effect that the rails that were thus bought in London were marked "Pittsburg, Pa." [Applause.]

From the advertisements of Thos. Potter, Sons & Co., oil-cloth manufacturers—protected 3 cents per square yard plus 20 per cent—I read:

April, 1908: A considerable shipment of Potter's table oilcloth to Amsterdam, Holland, in the face of the established English competition, illustrates that business for American goods can be had in any market. Practically the same situation exists in Australia, which buys annually a large yardage of Potter's table oilcloth.

September, 1908: Enamel goods of the Potter brand are the subject of numerous inquiries from carriage and automobile makers in various parts of the country and abroad.

A larger consignment than usual was shipped to Buenos Aires, Argentina, a few weeks ago.

October, 1908: The demand for Potter goods in Mexico, Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Australia, and India this season far exceeds that of any previous year.

November, 1908: Given a product that justifies its reputation, American goods find a market in any part of the world.

Potter goods have a steady and growing market in England and her dependencies, the shipments including all items of the Potter line.

It is a very interesting fact to me to know that in Worcester, Mass., there is a factory making corsets—I shall refer to that factory later on—which advertises openly that its goods are sold in 50 different countries.

In the *Exporters and Importers' Journal* for April 15, 1911, are 45 pages of 3 columns each devoted to detailed prices with illustrations of American goods for export, among which are neckwear, ladies' and misses' wash suits, trunks, furniture, cutlery, desks, cut glass, gasoline engines, lanterns, and other lines. The secretary of the wool association does not accurately express the facts respecting American export trade, and it is reaffirmed that this showing of American export manufacturers is a further evidence that not in few, but in many and increasing lines, American makers are in the markets of the world able to hold their own.

It is a great satisfaction to me to know that on the cotton gin manufactured by friends in Texas and operating on the Czar of Russia's private plantation in the heart of Turkestan are

certain fans and boilers of my own manufacture which are transporting cotton. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This is in spite of the heavy handicap imposed upon American manufacturers by our tariff in raising prices of their materials. With this removed our exports could be doubled.

That statement is not my own. It is a statement made to me within a fortnight by one of the largest manufacturers of machinery. It is not labor costs which hold our exports back but material costs. The lines in which our splendid export trade exist are, many of them, those on which the rate of wages is relatively high.

Before discussing the reference made by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers to the Tariff Board and the results to be expected from the latter, let us look at our wool industries as they are described by two others of its exponents. Referring again to the pamphlet entitled "The Wool Manufacture in America and Europe," I quote from page 6:

When establishing our enterprise we were obliged, in order to be able to compete, not only as to price but also with respect to quality and technical perfection, with the best European mills, to import most of our machinery, because a great deal of American spinning, weaving, dyeing, and finishing machinery is not yet so highly developed as the European. This is especially true of the machinery used in what is known as the French system of worsted spinning, which is being adopted more and more each year. Also our entire woolen spinning machinery had to be imported.

A great part of our looms could be bought here, while others had to be imported on account of special requirements; but those purchased in this country were nearly as expensive as the imported ones, so that in buying them we had to bear our share of the protection of the textile machinery of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague another hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD] is recognized for another hour.

Mr. REDFIELD. But those purchased in this country were nearly as expensive as the imported ones. I quote further:

Dyeing and finishing machinery used in our mill also had to be imported. In general, American manufacturers can buy domestic woolen and worsted machinery somewhat, but not very much, cheaper than imported machinery; but as the manufacture of woolen and worsted machinery, like the woolen industry itself, is younger and very much less developed in this country than Europe, such domestic machinery, especially that used for the production of finer goods, has not the same efficiency as the European, and consequently proves more costly in the long run.

I also quote from page 9:

The operatives in American woolen mills, in spite of the very much higher wages paid, are largely drawn from the ranks of unskilled labor. And whence does this unskilled labor come? There is little of it among native-born Americans. It is taken from the steady flow of immigrants into this country.

This same complaint about inefficient help comes from Philadelphia and from the southern mills. They should go to Worcester, Mass., to a corset factory employing 1,500 hands, mostly girls, of which a recent writer says:

One notices that all the employees—even the very youngest girls—show unusual intelligence, and the thought automatically suggests itself that this must be an unusually desirable place in which to work, a place workers would seek, a place which would not need to hunt for help when needed. On inquiry, we learn that there is usually a "waiting list" of applicants for work in the factory, and these the most desirable workers in a city of nearly 150,000 inhabitants.

The girls in that mill earn from \$9 to \$15 a week. That is the mill which I mentioned before as exporting its products to 50 different countries. And it is located only 40 to 50 miles from woolen mills that complain that they can not get sufficient help in America. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On page 2711 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 1, in the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES], I find the statement:

Nine-tenths of the worsted-spinning machinery is imported, because there is only one manufacturer of that class of machinery in this country.

And also the following statements:

In the woolen industry in Massachusetts there are 38,000 men and women, of whom 5,000 have native fathers, 33,000 have foreign fathers, so that 87 per cent are of foreign parentage or foreign born.

They come from Ireland, Canada, England, Germany, Scandinavia, Italy, Poland, Russia, Australia, and Scotland.

In the cotton business there are 89,000 men and women employed. Of these 7,000 had native fathers, while 82,000 were of foreign parentage. In other words, 92 per cent were foreign born or of foreign parentage.

Both these authorities admit that the American supply of textile machinery is not sufficient and not of the best quality. It would seem desirable, therefore, to remove the duty on such machinery, since it has failed to produce the manufacture of it in this country and is a heavy burden on our textile mills. Both these authorities also concede that the labor in our woolen mills is not American in its composition, but foreign, and that it is inefficient and therefore costly.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. REDFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. Does that statement as to textile material apply to cotton machinery?

Mr. REDFIELD. Not to so great a degree.

Mr. WEEKS. Does it apply to all cotton machinery?

Mr. REDFIELD. Not to so great a degree; not by any means. I shall be glad to go into that later on. It seems to me, on the statement of the woolen manufacturers themselves, that their industry is mechanically backward. It is, to use a colloquial phrase, 30 years behind the day, mechanically.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES] asks in his speech: "Is it not absurd to suppose that crossing the water changes a man's efficiency?" Surely; but methods differ. And that reminds me of a story. On this steamer that I mentioned coming from India was a large manufacturer of leather goods from the city of Philadelphia. He related the incident that on one occasion two young men who were leather finishers, we will say—I am not sure about the process, but it was a hand process in the manufacture of leather—two young Englishmen applied to him for employment, and he happened to go with them out in the mill where the work was done. He said he would be glad to take them on if they could do the regular stint of work. "Well," they said, "how many is that?" He said, "One hundred and twenty a day." "No, no," they said; "no man could do that and live." They had been accustomed to doing 50 a day in England, and that is all they could do, and all they thought any man could do. "Well," said the proprietor, "I am a practical leather man, and I will show you." And he took his brush there and worked an hour to illustrate, and when he had got done he found he had been working at the rate of 150 a day, and the two young men left because they were not willing to work up to the American standard of production.

I had the pleasure of spending the 14th instant in the mill managed by Mr. Forstmann, from whose pamphlet I have quoted. It is a large well-arranged mill, with modern equipment, good supervision, and, apparently, a good system of cost keeping. It is sharply differentiated from other worsted industries in making a class of goods of exceptionally high quality for men's and women's wear. Mr. Forstmann was told he could not succeed in making that class of goods in this country. He established his first mill in 1905 and has succeeded so well that about 18 months ago he put a second large mill in operation. He could not find American machinery suited for the peculiarly high class of goods, of which he seems to be the only, or almost the only, maker in the country, and his machines therefore chiefly are of German manufacture, some of English and French. In the purchase of these machines the tariff hit him hard, for he has paid over \$500,000 in duties upon machinery alone. He says such machinery could not be bought here at all. He is handicapped also as compared with his German competitors, for he has few, if any, competitors in this country, by having to pay about 40 per cent more for his raw material than the Germans do. He said to me repeatedly that a most serious handicap was the prejudice on the part of customers for high-class goods in favor of imported goods; that he found it difficult, sometimes impossible, to overcome this prejudice. That Mr. Forstmann has succeeded under these handicaps is a tribute to his exceptional skill and power. His particular industry is not typical of the worsted industry, because he makes a more expensive type of goods, and he has been established but a short time, not long enough even to have a firm market for his products, because of the prejudice stated. He complained of his inefficient labor. It is almost all foreign-born and certainly not efficient. If I were to criticize a courteous host and an able man, I should say the weak spot in his management was on the labor side. If this were brought up to the high level of equipment and arrangement I think his need of a tariff would be small. I told him that what he needed in his business was less tariff and more Forstmann. [Laughter.]

While he could probably do nothing else at the start under his conditions than purchase foreign machinery, I told him, and believe it is true, that our machinery makers would agree, if given an opportunity and a fair chance at all his business, to equip him as time went on with American machinery, designed and manufactured for his service, equal or superior to the best foreign make, and finally I pointed out to Mr. Forstmann that I believed he was being used by other woolen manufacturers differently circumstanced to cover their inefficiency behind his exceptional circumstances and difficulties. It is fair to say that Mr. Forstmann did not come here for his health, but undoubtedly established his mill because the tariff permitted him to make a profit, and that his success is evinced by the erection

recently of his second large mill. It is also right to say that other woolen manufacturers not far from him take a pride in the very high quality of labor, which Mr. Forstmann says he can not obtain. But it is an extraordinary condition of our law that it promotes such price for cloth to use as clothing as will permit a manufacturer to pay (as he says) 55 per cent more for his buildings, \$500,000 more for his plant, 40 per cent more for his raw material than is the case in Germany, and with inefficient labor to boot, to still make a profit out of us.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, whom I have quoted above, stated in his address that—

a woolen manufacturer, whom he cites as having a prosperous mill, made but 3½ per cent, without counting in a charge for interest on the money invested in the plant—

And states that this is true of 99 out of 100 mills engaged in that industry. He says—

that if their money had been placed in a savings bank those manufacturers could have sat idly by and twirled their thumbs and gotten more out of their investment than by working every day in the year.

It is a great pity that the Nation should be taxed that those woolen manufacturers should suffer in this way. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] If the net result of 50 years of high protection has been the absence of adequate and sufficient American machinery, the presence of an inefficient foreign labor force, and earnings of 3 to 18 per cent, then on the statement of the wool manufacturers themselves, protection has failed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If this is to continue, they might indeed better close their mills, let their people seek more lucrative employment, allow us to buy our woolen goods where we can get them most cheaply, and profit themselves by putting their money in the savings bank, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggests. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Yet I note discords in this sad harmony. Mr. Forstmann built a large new mill, and in the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts it is admitted that the American Woolen Co. claim to earn 9 per cent, and they have built two large new mills. Yet taking the statements made on this floor as a manufacturer by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and by the exponent of the Wool Association from New Jersey, it is conceded both that their industry has not built up an efficient working force and has not been able to develop a supply of adequate apparatus made at home. In this respect, and apparently in its earning power, it differs from other great manufacturing interests of the country. At the very time when our exports of manufactures have reached a point hitherto unknown and are still expanding, when the products of our factories are found around the wide earth, here rises up one of our oldest industries, nurtured by the law from our earliest days, for a bounty of 25 per cent was paid on textiles in Massachusetts as long ago as 1640, to say that it, and almost it alone, is feeble and needs the strong arm of taxation to support it.

But the record of all our textiles is not as bad as that of the worsted and woolen manufacturers.

I intended at this point to state the dividends, surpluses, and replacement values of some of our cotton-manufacturing companies.

That question of replacement values is very interesting. You will find a number of cotton plants in New England showing, let us say, a valuation on machinery of half a million dollars, and a statement made by their bankers here that the replacement value is two and a half million dollars. Somebody has been putting away a hidden reserve. Somebody has been making low valuations on machinery. There are several very interesting cases of that kind. It is a perfectly proper proceeding, so far as I know.

But I find a statement in the July circular of bankers dealing in industrial stocks that expresses the situation so sweetly that I prefer to use their words:

The past year has been a period of great financial uncertainty and of great depression in the manufacturing industries of the country. When we look back over the record of the stocks which we have offered to investors during this time it is very gratifying to see how their dividends have been maintained, and in many cases additions made to surplus accounts, while in a few instances the stocks have advanced to the highest prices at which they have sold in their history, and this record has been made in the face of falling prices for other securities.

At the present time investors are looking carefully into the dividend record of their investments and the safety of principal. We feel that the record of the mills we advise for investment this month is unique, and we especially wish to call attention to the date of the formation of each company. When you stop to think that mills which have paid dividends continuously for 35 to 40 years, have been through periods of panic and great stress many times, you must realize why we consider their stocks the most seasoned of securities. (Teft & Co., New York City, N. Y.)

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

There is here no evidence of poverty, nor is the mechanical end of the cotton industry as backward as that of the woolen mills is said to be.

From Cotton Chats, published by the Draper Co., I take the statement that in one mill with over 1,500 looms the weavers run from 16 to 32 looms each of the Northrop automatic type; in another mill, having both the Northrop and the common looms, the following facts exist:

They have 500 common looms, operated by 50 weavers; production, 87 per cent. On practically the same number of Northrop looms they had but 20 weavers; production, 97 per cent. There were three and one-half times as many seconds made on the common looms as on the Northrop.

Now, the Northrop loom is only adapted to certain kinds of goods, but I point out to you that where it is in use, in the same mill, the product is 97 per cent of the theoretical capacity of the loom, and with much fewer defective goods; whereas on the common loom the product is 87 per cent, with three and one-half times as many defective goods. And I say to you, gentlemen of the Democratic Party, that it ought to be shown here, when a cotton mill claims protection, whether it is in the 87 per cent and the bad class or whether it is in the 97 per cent and the good class, for it is no part of your duty to make good deficiencies in equipment. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Forstmann said that in his worsted mills the production was but 65 per cent of the theoretical loom capacity, but in German mills it was 85 per cent. The difference lay in the inefficient labor.

Another cotton mill claimed to be getting a production of 104 to 108 per cent of the theoretical capacity of their looms by running the automatic looms through the noon hour. In another mill 9 weavers were running 36 looms each. In another "a weaver on one common loom" made a cut of cloth at a weaving cost of \$1.50; on improved looms, they were "getting better goods for 15 cents per cut," and, finally, it is stated that by reason of the greater efficiency of the more modern loom over the common type "this additional product either reduces the labor cost of weaving or increases the weaver's pay, or both." The words are those of the Draper Co., large makers of textile machinery.

On the subject of efficiency of labor in cotton mills, Gen. William F. Draper, himself a large manufacturer of cotton machinery and owner in cotton mills, once a Member of this House, tells the following story: When in England he asked a cotton manufacturer there why he did not use the Northrop looms, which Gen. Draper's concern makes. The Englishman asked him to go with him to his mill. He did so, and the English manufacturer showed him some cloth on the inspection board and asked Gen. Draper if they made cloth of as good quality on the Northrop looms. Gen. Draper said they did not, and to the question "Why?" replied, "Because we have not the mill discipline."

Mr. H. L. Gantt, in his recent book, *Work, Wages, and Profits*, tells his experience in a cotton mill. After establishing an accurate cost system and training the workers in their duties, it was found that the average wages of the workers increased 40 per cent. The product increased 80 per cent, and the labor cost per piece was but 60 per cent of what it had been, and there were other savings. On the whole, it would seem that the cotton industry is not in that low state the wool men by their own statements occupy, and that by supplying that mill discipline which Gen. Draper said was lacking and which in one mill Mr. Gantt established, they should be able to get along profitably with a much smaller tax upon the public.

Perhaps our textile people want more self-help and less boosting. In Denmark farmers raise an average of 42 bushels of wheat per acre on soil cultivated for 1,000 years. We, I think, hardly reach half that, yet no one believes the Dane an abler and better farmer than the American can be, or thinks that when the latter is aroused to the need of intensive farming he will not excel. The remedy would not be to tax American food on the basis of Danish cost, but to grow more here. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, let us turn to the Tariff Board. The American Protective Tariff League does not think well of it. On January 26 last it said:

We are unable to discover any valid reason for the existence of a permanent tariff board or commission. The effort to obtain facts as to production cost has signally failed, and in the nature of things must fail. This fact stands virtually admitted by the most ardent supporters of the tariff-commission scheme. Production cost in our own country is so widely variant as to be of little value, even if it could be accurately ascertained, while the impossibility of either inducing or compelling foreign competitors to disclose the truth as to their production cost is so entirely obvious that any effort in that direction would be time and money wasted.

One notices here the conflict between the Republican platform of 1908 and the Protective Tariff League. One urges the difference in cost as the basis for the tariff; the other says production cost is of little value, "even if it could be accurately ascertained." So let us inquire about the Tariff Board, who

compose it, what its scope is, what has been done, and what are its limitations? We may then learn the value to be placed upon it.

The board is composed of 5 eminent gentlemen—2 of them economists, 1 a publisher of an agricultural journal, 1 a former officer in the Treasury, familiar with tariffs, and 1 for 14 years a Member of this House and in the last Congress a member of its Foreign Relations Committee. The two economists were professors in Yale University and in the University of Virginia, respectively. It does not reflect upon the ability or character of these gentlemen to say that none of them seem to have had practical manufacturing experience. It is one thing to know a great deal about a subject, but it is another and a very different thing to have lived for years in the very handling of that subject, and to have learned by daily contact with it not so much things about it as the life of the subject itself, thus becoming able to grasp not merely the statistics concerning the subject but the deeper facts that lie behind figures and give rise to statistics. The Tariff Board can not speak from personal knowledge of the facts it presents. It must transmit what it receives. It must learn from others both facts and their relations, and this will be a limitation upon its work so long as its organization is of the present character.

The scope of the work of this board covers nothing else than an examination into the details of all American industries. They are charged to make "investigation of the cost of production of commodities covering cost of material, fabrication, and every other element of such cost of production." This is a large order, the word "commodities" itself is rather comprehensive, and to "investigate every element of the cost of production" is a serious task. A modern authority says:

No one man in the space of life allowed to him for preparatory work can assimilate complete knowledge of all the functions of a business.

Many an able man in the limited scope of his own business has for years striven to investigate "every element of the cost of production" without full success. There were 533,000 American factories in 1905, with a capital of about \$14,000,000,000, and 6,700,000 employees paid over \$3,600,000,000, making a yearly product of over \$16,000,000,000. The task of the Interstate Commerce Commission is small compared with that of the Tariff Board, for though the railways have almost as much capital as the industries, they have but 1,500,000 employees and, compared to the infinite variety of products and processes in manufactures, the railroads' business is simple. The secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers says "the wool manufacture, as you know, is a very complex industry," and there are others, but the scope of our Tariff Board covers them all.

Yet this is but half the task. Comparison must be made with the industries of all great industrial nations. Three times in one year I went the length and breadth of Great Britain among its manufacturing districts. It would be a serious task to study and report on the industries of that one nation, but that alone is not sufficient, for Germany and France, at least, must be investigated ere the work of the Tariff Board is complete. There is some reasonableness in what the American Protective Tariff League said in the quotation just made.

But not only is a colossal task set for the Tariff Board, but it must be done with peculiar care. The taxation of 90,000,000 people is to be based on it. The revenue of our Government is involved. Some say the prosperity of our manufacturers and the wages of our workmen are dependent on it. The necessity, therefore, for accuracy and clearness is imperative, and also the need for freedom from interested influences, from guidance by those who are to be beneficiaries, perhaps, of the taxes to follow. Here is no place for partiality, incompleteness, or approximations. The sincerity of the gentlemen forming the Tariff Board is not questioned, nor their ability nor their desire to serve the public. Indeed it may possibly do good to have their inquiries proceed, but it is too much to expect that their reports shall have serious value as a basis for taxation, for this is against the very nature of things. The cost of production is not a thing on which a tariff tax can be based. I do not wish to do the Tariff Board an injustice or to minimize their work. I think, however, more is expected from them than it is humanly possible to supply and that their very name is a misnomer.

But the Tariff Board is indorsed by the President of the United States in a message to this House, and the National Tariff Commission Association, comprised in large part of manufacturers, has approved it. The National Association of Wool Manufacturers refer me to it for information, yet with this limiting clause:

European manufacturers have been exceedingly secretive about their labor costs and we on our side have never been able to secure satisfactory statements from them. However, much of the information of

this kind which we lack may now be forthcoming in the official reports of the Tariff Board.

The naive confession in the quotation that our woolen manufacturers have not known European costs is amusing, but why the reference to labor cost alone?

We are told manufacturers are cooperating with the Tariff Board, and that the latter have expressed gratification at "the completeness and precision of the information which the woolen and worsted mills are being able to furnish." Our hopes are not quickened by this harmony among the manufacturers. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] They are little likely to do themselves harm, and after their experience in fooling committees of Congress in the past the Tariff Board must indeed be wily and acute to steer its course straight. And here I remind the Tariff Board that figures are but the expression of facts and the statistical results in a mill may or may not be conclusive about that mill. The real facts lie behind and often can not be revealed, because the mill management is itself unconscious of them. Yet they may be, and often are, controlling facts as well as removable or manageable facts. For example, as a recent writer truly says:

Many industrial plants are seriously handicapped through the fact that the arrangement of their departments and equipment imposes operating expenses that are almost prohibitive.

We do not want to base a tariff on costs like that. Let us know, then, the conditions of cost, the causes of cost, that Congress may discriminate. If a tariff is to be based on costs, the prime factors operating to make costs must be made clear, else the cost itself merely misleads.

We are glad to know the Tariff Board are not undertaking all their duties at once. They are, papers sent by the President assure us, confining themselves to Schedules M, paper and pulp; A, chemicals; I, cotton manufactures; and K, woollens and worsteds; or 4 out of 14 schedules, together with a glossary covering 12 schedules, which, the President says, "will be a mine of information for Congress and the people on all statistical subjects relating to the tariff." We are glad the Tariff Board is undertaking no more now, and as respects the glossary, which will translate the tariff into plain English, this will be as welcome to the Democratic Party as it may prove inconvenient to some manufacturers. [Laughter.]

We can, however, judge the services of the Tariff Board in their relations to taxation by their report entitled the "Pulp and News-print Paper Industry" (S. Doc. No. 31), of which the report sent by the President says it "can properly be regarded as a specimen of the work which the board can accomplish." Let us look at this pamphlet. The papers sent by the President say:

The essence of it is contained in Tables 4 and 5, on page 28, and in Table 17, on page 52.

And that—

the facts contained in these tables afford a sounder basis for intelligent action by Congress than has ever heretofore been available, although the report is replete from beginning to end with useful and enlightening data.

Recalling that the American Protective Tariff League said, on January 26 last, "production cost in our own country is so widely variant as to be of little value," we note with interest the further statement that "one of the significant facts brought out is the wide discrepancy in plant efficiency." But how can it be said that this discrepancy in plant efficiency is brought out by this report when the American Protective Tariff League four months earlier pointed out the variation in cost, a commonplace fact known to every cost keeper and thoughtful manufacturer. The report sent us by the President suggests that—

this should have a wholesome influence in stimulating all owners of plants of low efficiency to secure the obvious benefits to be obtained by conforming them to the best modern practice.

This is true, but the manufacturers knew it before, and every manufacturer with sense has known it for years. The manufacturer having a plant of low efficiency who does not know that the benefits of modern practice were obvious would be a curiosity. The stimulus to improve his plant are his own high costs and consequent lack of sales or profits. Technical papers have for years been full in almost every line of industry of the importance of modern and efficient equipment and the need of watching and reducing costs. There are publications devoted to the science of costs. The statement which the President sends us is the merest truism, and the facts behind it neither were brought out for the first time by the Tariff Board nor are confined to the particular industry of which it has treated, nor are they clear now. We are not told the causes of these facts and the cause is the essential thing. What is here said has been as obvious and as well known in the manufacturing world as that 2 and 2 make 4.

The report through the President would have been more accurate had he said that this particular report made it clear that

it will be impossible to base a tariff upon such facts. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Four of the tables which are said to contain the "essence of this report" show that in making ground wood pulp manufacturing labor varies in cost per ton of product from 98 cents to \$5.90; that what are called "other costs" vary from 30 cents per ton to \$6.83 per ton; and that material cost—that is, wood—varies per ton from \$6.90 to \$13.33. Similar facts are shown about sulphite fiber and news-print paper, and while labor in making sulphite fiber varies in cost from \$2.09 a ton to \$6.51 a ton, in making news-print paper it varies from \$2.19 a ton to \$7.26 a ton, in both cases showing a variation in the single item of labor cost of over 300 per cent. An average is shown in the tables, but what use is it? You can not fix a tax on an average, for in so doing you pay a bonus on all below it, and if protection be sought you do not get it for those above the average. How in the name of common sense are these facts available as a basis for taxation? Will you base your tax on the lowest cost? Then what becomes of your protective theory for those working at the higher cost? For it may well be that your element of lowest cost comes in some one mill well located, equipped, and managed, and to take its cost as the basis might, from the protective theory, close up the other mills, force them to sell out, and create a trust. Contrariwise, if you base your tax upon the highest cost, you may be putting a premium on inefficiency and taxing the Nation for incompetency. In all sincerity, I can not see that the table named takes the least step toward enlightening Congress as to how to base a tariff tax on the country. It seems to me to show plainly that a tariff tax based on the cost of production is ridiculous. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is an interesting piece of clerical work; it is no more. It contributes nothing to the science of costs.

Turn now to Table 5, to which the report from the President refers. In it the lowest cost of ground wood pulp (under \$10 per ton) is confined to two establishments, while 22 operate at a cost of from \$16 to \$20 a ton. Similar facts appear respecting sulphite fiber and news-print paper. Table 6 deals with the labor cost, and the minimum of 98 cents per ton in ground wood pulp appears in but one establishment, while 18 operate at a labor cost from \$1.50 to \$2, and 11 have a labor cost of \$2.50 to \$3, and others higher. Similar facts exist in sulphite fiber and news-print paper. The report shows that the variations in labor cost are principally due to change in available water power, and in this and other respects may make clearer, perhaps, to the country what the Democratic Party urges, viz, that the cost of production has so many varying, conflicting, and complex elements that it is an absurdity to make it a basis of a tariff tax.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDFIELD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENROOT. I will ask the gentleman whether the amount of revenue to be derived from any given duty does not depend to a large extent upon the domestic cost of the production of that commodity?

Mr. REDFIELD. I do not know why it should necessarily; it may or it may not.

Mr. LENROOT. In other words, if the revenue duty be in excess of the difference in the cost of production between foreign and domestic, does it not become prohibitive?

Mr. REDFIELD. Yes.

Nor does the table on page 17, to which the report from the President refers, help. It shows the "efficiency of labor by paper machines of given sizes and capacities" and these vary from 82 cents per ton minimum to \$1.84 per ton maximum, or over 120 per cent on a single operation in the manufacture of paper. What does this do but emphasize the absurdity of a fixed tariff on a variable cost? Truly one begins to realize why the American Protective Tariff League is not interested in production cost, because the more that is known about it the more candid men see that the only logical basis of tariff taxation is one that takes into account chiefly the revenue to be derived from it. If the papers sent us by the President indorse the Tariff Board in showing the tariff plank of the Republican platform of 1908 to be absurd, then we concur with him, for it has done just that.

But the Tariff Board do not know and can not show certain fundamental facts going deeper than their figures. Every one of the costs they have given must change. Any one of them may have changed before their report was printed; there is no assurance that the facts are to-day as they were on May 15. To one backward mill has come an able manager perhaps and its costs have gone down; the skillful head of an efficient mill has died and its costs have gone up. Management is a con-

trolling factor in industries. In another mill a master mechanic has invented something, and by its use the costs are altered. It is altogether probable that in the most efficient mill the costs are lower than they were because their present efficiency is a measure of their ability to add to that efficiency. The whole thing is and must be in a state of flux, and one or more of the different classes shown in the tables may already have ceased to exist.

Take a simple illustration: Let each of the costs ascertained by the Tariff Board be represented by a little block such as children use to play with; set these blocks in a row upon the table in the Ways and Means Committee room in the order they occupy in the Tariff Board's report; gather about the table and proceed to base your tariff tax upon them. But wait, for while you are taking your seats the blocks commence to move among themselves and by the time you have discussed No. 1 it has moved in between Nos. 3 and 4, and No. 5 has become No. 1, and Nos. 10 and 12 have ceased to exist at all, or a new number has come in at the farther end, and you have before you a dancing series of costs, so to speak. "Where are you at?" This represents what the American Protective Tariff League meant when they said, "Cost is widely variant." To take an example from current business: Would a cost on cotton yarn taken from a Tariff Board report based on costs to-day be fair with cotton at its recent price, or would you take your cost next year based on a bumper crop, and would either have value unless you knew conditions?

At best the report of the Tariff Board can only be a preliminary one of progress—rather like one scene in a vitagraph show. A worsted manufacturer who has furnished them data told me that to make the report exhaustive would require five years. I have looked over the blank forms used by the Tariff Board in its investigation of the wool and worsted and the cotton industries; they are complete so far as to show the facts of record, but lack precisely the element which it is essential to have and which the Tariff Board can not get, viz, those controlling factors which are not and can not be recorded. In any industry the personality of the management is felt all through the mills; its prejudices, its weakness, its strength, are reflected through the enterprise. There are cases where personal power has made good defects in equipment and methods; but in several mills reported by the Tariff Board how can they show the action of this force? It may be the chief factor, but it is not a factor of record. I know of two such cases. In one a man who had accomplished great results was for other reasons allowed to go, and the costs of those two mills sprang upward with his going. In the other the man went to another large works, and with his advent the costs began going down.

Take some examples from life:

Two woolen mills are located not far apart. One takes pride in the character and efficiency of its working force, speaks of it with enthusiasm, but keeps no costs and is badly equipped; the other has an accurate system of costs and fine equipment, but complains it is seriously handicapped by the inefficiency of the working force. One mill is scientifically planned; the other is an accident. Again, two large mills pursue one of their leading processes in different ways; from it one saves a large by-product, paying the entire cost of the process; the other says it does not pay to do so. In another shop the policy is adopted of a man to two machines, running same slowly to save repairs and keep down labor; in its competitive shop on the same work two men are running one machine, which is designed and made as perfectly as possible and speeded to full limit. Here is a radical difference in policy of carrying on the same process.

If the cost of production is to be made the basis for the tariff, then the tendency of that cost should appear. Suppose the labor cost of a yard of cloth is stated at 50 cents; that means one thing if it is the upward end of a series reading 40, 45, 50, and another thing if it is the downward end of the series, 60, 55, 50, and still another thing if it has run along for one or more years at just 50 cents. It is an axiom that "Costs can not be charged on a basis of a short period." Therefore the Tariff Board, to give an intelligent picture of an industry, should show its past as well as its present and in some practical way indicate its future. This they have not done, and I doubt if it is feasible to do it.

It is essential also that in judging of costs one should know what the relative efficiency of the management is, as shown, for example, in such matter as stoppages of machinery. In a southern cotton mill they got as high as 104 and 108 per cent of the theoretical capacity of an automatic loom; in a northern mill they got 87 per cent. The owner of a large woolen mill told me that the best his business permitted was 65 per cent. From the point of view of taxation it should be shown not so

much whether 65 per cent was the fact, as it doubtless was, but whether that fact could not be improved, for we have no business to base a tariff on a policy which may be inefficient. I do not find in the blank forms used by the Tariff Board anything that covers factors of this character.

Nor do I find in their forms any call for facts from the second and third parties in interest of whom I spoke at first, viz, the workers and consumers. And I submit that no industry can be fairly judged on statements made by the owners and managers alone. There have been mills and times where and when the workers' point of view did not at all agree with that of the owners, and the workers have as intimate knowledge of many details of mill operation as anyone. I think it is a defect of the report upon the pulp and news-print-paper industry that no one speaks in or through it for the workers in those mills. What they have to say might alter the looks of things or change the relations of facts, and if the Tariff Board shall report upon the wool and worsted industries without reflecting facts submitted by those who represent the workers in the mills, or those who buy the goods made by the mills, it will be partial and perhaps misleading. It is the owner's business by means of the worker to supply the consumer, and no true picture of the industry can omit the viewpoint of each. A tax based upon any one of the changing items of cost might sadly affect the consumer, and it may be found that another of the statements of cost was inconsistent with the health or the reasonable comfort of the worker. Congress should know all that, and it all forms part of the charge upon the Tariff Board to consider "every element of production."

I do not find in the blank forms of the Tariff Board any provision whereby it can be shown whether separate departments or processes in a textile mill pay a profit or make a loss, yet to this very end does modern accounting point. Nor do I see how a manufacturer can direct his economies with the best intelligence until this is known. If in a mill four operations pay and two do not, clearly attention should be put on the two. If one does not know that these two exist in this condition, he can not directly economize on them. Yet we should not want to pay a tariff tax based on his costs if the latter by proper accounting could be corrected.

This leads to the one service the Tariff Board have rendered, viz, that of teaching manufacturers the necessity of keeping costs and how to keep them, for they have discovered that many manufacturers have no cost system and that their statements of cost have been guesses. Their eyes are opened by the forms the Tariff Board use, and they have in some measure adopted these forms for future use. This has real value to industry, but it is a far step from it to basing a tariff tax upon what these costs shall come to be when the manufacturers learn how to keep them. Meanwhile, how shall the Tariff Board convey to you and me that which the manufacturers do not know themselves? Again, among the factors affecting costs are such matters as location, the character and arrangement of buildings, their lighting, the proper routing within the mill, methods of transporting goods, and so forth. The report of the Tariff Board will be incomplete unless accompanied by explanations as to how far in actual cases these factors have influence. A company had two mills on opposite sides of a river. It cost a good deal to haul the goods back and forth. One day a trolley overhead conveyor was erected, and this cost nearly disappeared. We do not want to base tariffs on elements of cost that may be or have been evolved out of existence.

Nor will it be sufficient that the Tariff Board show to us that goods of the same weight, width, and character cost so much made in this country and so much abroad. It will be necessary to show that the quantities made at the time these costs were taken were alike, and also that the mills were alike in equipment, management, and other conditions affecting cost. A comparison made between an American mill badly located as respects power, transportation, with poor equipment and inefficient labor, can not properly be compared with a foreign mill superior in these respects, unless it is shown that none of these conditions are alterable. And if the conditions in the foreign and domestic mills, whose goods are thus compared, are unlike as to burden costs, this should also be shown. It is customary in our factories to distribute burden cost so as to place it where it is most easily borne. Conditions frequently make it impracticable to charge its full share of burden to one line of goods, so the burden is apportioned, and a lighter share is put upon one line and a heavier elsewhere. The report of the Tariff Board should, of course, determine where such factors exist and to what extent, else a tariff based upon a relative cost might be misleading and even avoided possibly by simply changing the method of accounting.

It must be clear that there is not, and in the nature of things can not be, any fixed line of domestic costs or any fixed difference between foreign and domestic costs on which a finger can be laid. Cost is so essentially variable in time and in other conditions that the very data on which a report is based will alter before it is printed. On page 25 of the pulp and news-print paper industry report the Tariff Board says:

It appears that the costs in a single mill vary greatly from month to month of a given year; if the margin between selling price and manufacturing costs were taken on the basis of the best month it would give an entirely wrong impression of the facts.

It is unfair to say goods cost so much without saying the conditions under which these costs prevail. Nor is a total or average statement of any kind accurate. It must be resolved into elements and their relations shown. To say that in England the labor cost on certain goods is 50 cents per yard and in America 80 cents per yard may mean little or nothing. Before anything can be inferred from it further facts are needed. Are the goods standard or special? Are they alike in material, character, and weight? Is the quantity made at one time the same? Is the machine on which it is made the same, and, if not, how does it differ? Does it run at the same speed and with the same percentage of stoppages? What are the methods of handling goods in each case? What is the proportion of "seconds" in each case? What is the relation of the management to the worker in each case? What are the conditions of light and power, of space and arrangement, of sanitation and ventilation? What are the relative charges for repairs and other elements of burden?

You can not offset a well-disciplined German against an ill-disciplined American mill until you have shown that good discipline is impossible here. The Tariff Board may perhaps render a service by establishing standards to which our industries may gradually approach, but when this shall have been done and our industries developed to the fullest output with the most perfect apparatus and arrangement there will remain small need for protective tariffs.

As a final suggestion of certain unseen but important elements in the cost of production, I suggest that the Tariff Board should give us such facts as these: What is done by the mills in the way of time study; that is, to learn and teach the easiest and quickest way of doing the work? Do they determine the personal characteristics of their workers as to eyesight or quickness of perception or action, for one person moves more slowly than another, one person sees more quickly than another. Do they take care that their operatives are selected by their special fitness for their line of work? What is the amount of absence for sickness? How frequently do the workers change? What variation exists as to the loss of time? Among different mills what amount of time is lost in accidents? What are the deductions from wages, and how are they made? What is the percentage of defective goods made? Can they show the daily history of, say, 100 looms of each, say, 10 textile mills? What is done in the way of well-directed effort toward a definite result, or is it merely a matter of surpassing previous achievements?

I have said little about the relative rate of wages per operative, because what this rate of pay is per person or per day affects the inquiry only in a minor degree. We all agree in believing this rate of daily pay per person to be larger in America than elsewhere. We wish to keep it so; but the Tariff Board is concerned rather in what the labor cost is per unit of product; and if the higher wage paid here does not appear greater in efficiency and productiveness, a field is opened for searching study. It will not suffice to report merely that labor is paid more per person and leave the crude and ignorant inference to be wrongfully drawn that it therefore costs more per unit of product, for this is known not to be so in many, perhaps in most, industries. And they are chargeable with the duty of finding whether it is so in textiles and, if so, of saying why. And it is because of the direct bearing of other matters than the wage rate on this labor cost that I have gone so fully into them. Are we then to have no inquiry into the costs of production? Why do we need it at the hands of a public body? If the National Association of Woolen Manufacturers, or similar body, would appoint with broad powers a permanent committee on the reduction of costs consisting of practical commercial and mechanical experts in their line, assisted by any well-known firm of certified public accountants, their annual verified reports, if made full and clear, would convey more than that of any nonexpert body could.

Neither in this or in any other form do I object to the fullest inquiry. All knowledge is helpful. But to predicate in advance the purpose for which the knowledge is to be used be-

fore the knowledge itself is gained seems to me absurd, and to make our study of costs a basis for taxation is, I think, to found our financial house upon the sand.

And now, gentlemen, as I began with the human interest I close with it. Both sides of this House agree in the patriotic desire for the welfare of our people. Beside this no tariff tax, no investigation, has serious relative importance. I believe it is clear that a tariff can not be placed upon a supposed difference in production costs, and that logically a tariff for revenue is the only practicable thing; but no one, and least of all the Democratic Party, intend that the lot of the worker shall be worse; nay it must be better, else we have all sadly failed. Better I mean as a general and permanent growth and condition rather than worse as a result of the scare and caprice of some frightened employers. As I also said, can we translate into terms of human happiness the laws of business and of taxation? I believe we can, for if our industries shall learn that when well equipped, well housed, well managed, the higher wage is the only course productive of low labor expense, then shall we be cutting away the very roots of poverty. Therefore I would have the Democratic Party take strong and affirmative ground; would have it to say to manufacturers: You shall have no more special privilege, you shall equip your mills with the best apparatus, you shall house your workers in the best way, you shall manage your labor by the most scientific methods, conserving your men better than you do your machines, and you shall pay them and treat them justly and wisely because it is sane and profitable so to do. And to the worker we shall say: Do your best, for where that is done under the best conditions and with the best tools and equipment the result will be a higher wage for you and a lower cost for you and your fellow workman. And to the consumer we shall say: You will profit as the owner and the worker profit by the combination of good equipment, proper buildings, wise management, and high pay. One of the first acts of creation in the oldest of books is said to be the great command "Let there be light," and if the great Democratic Party can throw the light of this industrial truth into the dark industrial places there shall be in very truth a new creation. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and Mr. CULLOP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12812 and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I would like to make a suggestion to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. I would like to close general debate when we adjourn to-morrow. I understood from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there would be no objection to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow. I ask unanimous consent to close debate to-morrow; and if it is agreeable to the gentleman from New York, I will now ask unanimous consent to take a recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening, for debate only, and to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Alabama, if he will permit, that the hour of meeting to-night better be made 8 o'clock.

Mr. PAYNE. I have no objection to that program, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want to be caught in this way by some Member raising an objection to-morrow to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday. I think in that event the debate ought to close on Thursday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then we will let that portion of the request go over until to-morrow.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the regular order fixing 12 o'clock for the hour of meeting be changed so that the House will meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the order that the House meet at 12 o'clock noon be changed to-morrow, Wednesday, August 2, 1911, so that the House will meet at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night.

Mr. PAYNE. One moment, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he embody in the agreement that there be no other business transacted this evening—except debate on this bill in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask to make it a unanimous-consent order. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night for the purpose of general debate on the cotton bill, and that no other business be transacted except general debate upon that bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know but that it would be a good thing, if we could make it effective, to have included in that an agreement that the point of no quorum may not be raised.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That would not be effective, I think.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night, and that the session to-night be for general debate only upon the cotton bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Accordingly, at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired the House was called to order by the Speaker.

COTTON SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12812) to reduce the duties on the manufactures of cotton.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12812) to reduce the duties on manufactures of cotton, with Mr. CULLOP in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from New York desired to consume some time first this evening and intended to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the ranking member of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means I should like, if possible, to come to some understanding with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee as to the division of time. I know of no one upon this side who desires to speak except the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding with the gentleman from New York was that he intended to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I do not know what time he intended to yield, but if the gentleman will state the time—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He intended to yield one hour, and upon his departure he observed that he wished the gentleman from Pennsylvania would look out for the interests of this side of the House, and that is the reason I ventured to see if we could come to some understanding.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The order of the House was that the time shall be equally divided. When the gentleman has concluded we will probably have some one to speak on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have proceeded far enough into this extraordinary session of Congress to have it made perfectly plain to every citizen who has money to invest in industrial enterprises, and to every workman who obtains his livelihood in industrial occupations, as to what they may expect if the Democrats, who have obtained control of this House, succeed in controlling the country. If the plans of the Democratic leaders do not miscarry there is to be a complete change of our tariff policy to a revenue basis, and, in the language of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], coming fresh from the Democratic caucus, "there is to be no protection in it." It is not sufficient that spectacular investigations after "malefactors of great wealth" are to harass and annoy the general business interests, we are to have such a revision of the tariff "from top to bottom" as will bring every American enterprise to a European basis, notwithstanding the great disparity in the cost of production and the scale of wages at home and abroad.

Evidently, as the situation is viewed by our Democratic brethren, we have gone forward with too rapid strides in our Republican desire to make the United States the most progressive and prosperous of all the countries of the world, and must now submit to a lowering of the gates, which will permit our splendid markets to become the chosen field of our European competitors. Viewed solely from the standpoint of the cotton grower, who has a virtual monopoly of his product, it may not seem so serious a problem as it does to the great mass of the people who are dependent upon the industries for their support.

EASY TO FIND FAULT.

It is true that a great wave of misrepresentation as to industrial conditions has swept over the country in recent campaigns, and that there has been a growing tendency to criticize the existing order and to find fault with the party in power. It is easy for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], as he did in presenting his cotton bill on Friday last, to declare that "the Republican Party has bankrupted the country." The statement is politically alluring, and finds easy access to the press of the country, but it is not so easy after the sensation has done its deadly work to catch up to the legion of readers with the simple truth that at the close of business on July 1 last there was in the Treasury for the fiscal year 1911 an actual excess of receipts over disbursements of \$45,859,673.59. Anyone who takes the trouble to examine the statement of the United States Treasury can satisfy himself as to the accuracy of these figures, notwithstanding all the maledictions that have been hurled at the Payne tariff bill and the Republican Party.

CUTTING DOWN THE REVENUE.

Although this extra session of Congress was called for the specific purpose of considering reciprocity with Canada, and might well have ended with that, the eagerness of the Democratic leaders to make known their purposes with regard to tariff legislation has been emphasized from day to day. In no instance have we heard a word in favor of constructive legislation. On the contrary, distrust of prevailing conditions, the desire for investigation at Federal expense, and a general tendency toward oppressive and destructive legislation have been the rule. With an enthusiasm bordering upon exuberance, the Democratic leaders, intrenched behind their bales of cotton, and far removed from the borderland of Canada, gloried in the prospect of Republican dissension and the loss of \$5,000,000 of revenue in the reciprocity bargain. Then they came forward with their farmers' free-list bill, proposing a direct slap at the manufacturing industries, with an incidental loss of \$10,000,000 of revenue, saved chiefly upon factory products made by cheap labor in India and essential to the packing and shipment of southern cotton into foreign lands.

CLEVER MOVES TO EMBARRASS REPUBLICANS.

And then, with a cleverness that does credit to a leadership intent upon the acquisition of national control, they came forward with their bill for the revision of the wool schedule, hoping further to rend Republicans asunder by drawing the line between the farmer and the manufacturer, with the incidental thought of reducing the latter to the level of his European competitors. By the adjustment of the duties in the wool bill it was proposed to cut down the revenue about \$1,300,000. And now, as the very acme of Democratic complacency, we have the bill for the revision of the cotton schedule, proposing a further reduction of revenue to the extent of \$3,000,000. Should this extraordinary session continue at much greater length and these measures evincing Democratic intent upon a helpless country continue to be presented, it certainly would not be very long before we would be reduced from a protective to "a revenue basis," with the complete elimination of the Republican surplus of \$45,000,000, reported to be in the Treasury on July 1 last. But even so, we shall not despair, for it is possible the people, who have been the chief sufferers during the progress of this remarkable Democratic program, will sooner or later awaken to a full understanding of its significance, and shake off the burden of direct taxation which, in lieu of the tariff, it is proposed to place upon them.

REPORT A REMARKABLE DOCUMENT.

It was a remarkable report which accompanied the cotton bill submitted by the gentleman from Alabama, a report evincing much historical and statistical research, covering no less than 539 printed pages, a credit to the industry of the committee and its compiler; but one will search in vain through its many pages for testimony from the mills and the men who work in them as to the wisdom or effect of a reduction of duties in the cotton schedule. Indeed, we are informed that although numerous appeals for a hearing were made to the chairman of the committee by the vast army of American citizens who have their money invested in cotton mills and allied industries, and from workmen and working women who obtain their livelihood in these American establishments, there was no heed to the call—nothing but history, statistics, and theory behind the closed doors of the committee room.

Even the committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, made up largely of southern men, and Democrats at that, were denied a hearing. Bulletins have been published by this association, inclosing the correspondence between its officers and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and are now in the possession of the Members of Congress. The following letter from the chairman of the Ways and Means

Committee best describes the attitude and conclusion of the committee with regard to public hearings:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1911.

Mr. R. M. MILLER, Jr., Charlotte, N. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee had its first meeting on the cotton schedule this morning. After looking over the facts before us and the briefs, they concluded not to go into general hearings on the subject.

I am in receipt of the brief you have already filed with the committee, and it will receive careful attention. Should you desire to place further facts before us, I will be glad to receive them personally, or by letter, as you desire. We will probably be at work on the cotton schedule for the next 10 days before reaching any final conclusion in reference to the matter.

Yours, very truly,

O. W. UNDERWOOD, Chairman.

HEARINGS BY BRIEF.

Failing to be heard, the Manufacturers' Association submitted its protest and argument in writing. It is important that this statement should be preserved, as bearing upon the attitude of the committee, and I incorporate it herewith as a part of my remarks:

CHARLOTTE, N. C., July 13, 1911.

Mr. O. W. UNDERWOOD,

Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: As instructed by the tariff committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, which met here in Charlotte to-day, I have the honor to reply further to your favor of the 6th instant, stating our position on proposed legislation relating to Schedule I, cotton manufactures, as follows:

(1) We are opposed to any revision that will increase the percentage of importations to total United States cotton manufactures that now exists.

In figuring percentages of importations to manufactures we call attention to the fact that importations under the cotton manufactures schedule were 17½ per cent of the total cotton manufactures for the year 1910, including laces and other such luxuries that are not as yet made in great quantity in this country, although it is interesting to note that the manufacture of laces in the United States increased in value from three and one-half millions in 1900 to nearly ten millions in 1910.

We believe that any way it may be considered, that the present importations are sufficient to protect the consumer by regulating prices, for there is no monopoly or restraint of trade, but, on the contrary, the keenest competition among cotton manufacturers of the United States.

We do not believe that anything more regulative of prices can be secured, however much importations may be increased, for American manufacturers are already down to cost; and without radical cutting of wages which is not believed could or should be effected, the chief result of legislating more foreign goods into this country would be only to transfer that work to foreigners, for the importers do not usually undersell a local market except enough to bring in their goods.

We believe that the cotton schedule bears its share of the customs revenue for the support of the Government, and that there is no call for increasing the amount collected under it.

(2) We are opposed to revision without adequate data.

(3) We offer our assistance in obtaining such data.

(4) We are in favor of such revision as will protect all classifications under the schedule primarily in proportion to their labor costs, and are especially in favor of simplification of the schedule.

(5) We are opposed to any revision that does not take into account differences in other conditions as well as labor costs, particularly on account of southern mill conditions.

(6) We are opposed to reductions of duty on machinery and other items entering into the cost of mills, except such as will keep them on a parity with our own industry as to labor and other costs at home and abroad. We do not want our property depreciated, nor do we want broadly to injure other industries to help our own. Let each case rest on its merits and benefit equally.

(7) We are opposed to personal hearings; too often it has been alleged that unfair advantage has been taken that way in making the tariffs of the past.

(8) We are in favor of publicity and record and of the freest and most open discussion and consideration of everything relating to tariff making.

(9) We demand that the data upon which revision is based be made public and a matter of record, except with such concealment of names that good faith dictates with those furnishing data. If publicity is good for other things, and we believe it is, it certainly is desirable in such a vitally important matter as the tariff.

We also demand a definite statement as to just what it is intended by its makers that the revision shall accomplish:

(a) What measure of protection is it intended to afford to American cotton manufacturers—equality in labor cost only, equality in cost of production, or what?

(b) How much relative increase or decrease is intended in importations, which means how much more or less competition is it intended to impose upon us?

(c) If more competition, how are we expected to meet it?

(d) If we are expected to cut labor, how is that labor to be compensated for the reduction, and what can it definitely expect in lesser cost of living to offset the cut?

(e) What amount of revenue is the new tariff on cotton manufactures expected to yield?

(f) What reduction is expected, if any, in the cost of articles of cotton manufacture to the consumer at retail stores?

We ask consideration of the above in the spirit in which it is offered.

We intend no reflection; we merely ask to have our way pointed out by those who make the way.

We beg to have it borne in mind that our industry directly concerns 2,000,000 people, and indirectly many more; that we are not simply manufacturers and employees asking protection for our property and our labor, but that we are consumers and that we are citizens, most of whom voted for the party proposing this revision and who expected not only that any revisions would be made with as much prudence as would be exercised in private business matters, but also that they would be

conducted with all the publicity that was generally promised among other reforms.

We beg to remain, respectfully, yours,

R. M. MILLER, Jr., *Chairman.*

MANY SOUGHT TO BE HEARD.

Not only the associated manufacturers sought to be heard, but a large number of individuals acting upon their own responsibility implored a hearing. They wanted to show that there was no good reason for a reduction of tariff duties on cotton manufactures, and that the advantage of such a reduction, while it would operate against American industries, would be wholly in the interest of the foreigner. They wanted to show that the man who invested his money in industrial establishments, as well as the man who made his wages therein, was not responsible for the increase in the cost of living, but that if the prices were high, they were due to middlemen or importers, and not to the protective-tariff system. Here is a copy of a letter forwarded from New Orleans which serves to elucidate this question:

ALDEN MILLS,

New Orleans, La., June 20, 1911.

Hon. O. W. UNDERWOOD,

Chairman Ways and Means Committee,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have taken the liberty to submit to you, under separate cover, samples of a cotton sock and stocking manufactured by us, and which are commonly known as "10 centers."

The figures attached to these hose tell their own story. At the present time there is over 100 per cent profit to the jobber and retailer.

When we first commenced to manufacture these goods, some 10 or 12 years ago, we received 27½ per cent more than the present price. This 27½ per cent has been absorbed by the people who were most active in the last campaign against the hosiery tariff, and who have absorbed this 25 per cent from the American manufacturer and have not given any portion of the benefit of the same to the consumer, as the price on this hosiery to the consumer is the same to-day, namely, 10 per pair.

"Will a further profit for the middleman reduce the price of the article to the consumer?"

Yours, truly,

W. H. McLELLAN, *Manager.*

WROTE TO SOUTHERN REPRESENTATIVES.

To his Representative in Congress the writer of the above letter, W. H. McLellan, wrote more fully and more earnestly, as follows:

ALDEN MILLS,

New Orleans, La., June 20, 1911.

DEAR SIR: Under separate cover I have taken the liberty of forwarding you prepaid samples of what is known as 10-cent hosiery; these socks and stockings are sold to the consumer at 10 cents per pair. We are at the present time delivering these to the various jobbers throughout the country at 4.98 cents per pair for the hose and 4.69 cents for the socks, leaving a profit of over 100 per cent to be divided by the jobber and retailer.

For your information would say that we commenced to manufacture this particular line in 1901, at which time we received 27½ per cent more for this identical stocking and sock than we are getting at the present time. Prices to consumer at this time was 10 cents, the same as it is now.

We have been able to absorb this 25 per cent loss in two methods: first, the increase of our business, the volume of which reducing the overhead charges. The second, by the installation of the most modern and improved machines at an outlay of several hundred thousand dollars.

Should the tariff affecting the low end of hosiery, which is a necessity to the working people, be changed I fail to see where it will reduce the price to the consumer, for a reduction of over 25 per cent has not had the desired effect of benefiting the consumer.

I therefore trust that you will consider this matter wisely before plunging and consider the effect of your act upon the 400 to 500 hands employed by our factory in New Orleans as well as the large amount of money invested.

Please bear in mind that the last active campaign against the tariff on the domestic hosiery was engineered and financed by two of the largest jobbers and retailers in this country, who, from the figures on the hosiery submitted to you by me, show that, notwithstanding the fact that they have forced a 25 per cent reduction on the price of these articles, they are still levying the same money from the consumer.

Yours, truly,

W. H. McLELLAN, *Manager.*

THE FLODDER AND THE MIDDLEMAN.

Speaking for another mill doing business in Meridian, Miss., the same writer makes the following statement, which ought to appeal to those who believe it commendable to start enterprises in the South and give them a chance to live:

PRISCILLA MILLS,

Meridian, Miss., June 20, 1911.

DEAR SIR: As suggested by our esteemed favor of May 4, I have taken the liberty of submitting prepaid under separate cover a sample of the sock and stocking manufactured by our concern. The sock we manufacture in New Orleans and the hose is made exclusively at the Meridian mill.

The figures attached to these stockings tell their own story.

For your information would say that we have been manufacturing this line for some 15 to 20 years, these particular numbers for 12 years. When we first commenced to manufacture these numbers our price to the jobber was 27½ per cent above the present figure, at which time the consumer purchased the stockings at the same price they pay to-day, namely, 10 cents per pair.

Notwithstanding the fact that the middle man has obtained a reduction from the manufacturer of 27½ per cent, the price to the consumer has remained the same.

This readily explains why the last campaign which was so actively waged against the reduction of the tariff on hosiery was engineered and financed by two of the largest jobbers and retailers in the United

States. Having forced a profit of 27½ per cent from the manufacturers these jobbers realize how easy under the cloak of free trade an additional amount of profit can be obtained.

But at whose expense? The consumer will hardly receive the benefit of it if up to the present time he has not received any benefit from the 27½ per cent reduction which American manufacturers have been able to make on the price of their goods through the installation of the most modern and improved machines which represents an enormous amount of money; in our case very near \$500,000.

Now, if you will stop to think that this little plant at Meridian employing some 150 people and manufacturing 1,200 dozen pairs of ladies' stockings daily (which are being placed on the sidewalk of the jobber at a cost of 4.98 cents per pair), each dozen of these stockings consuming 1½ pounds of cotton what chance is there for the American manufacturer should the cheap labor of Europe and Asia be brought in close competition?

For your information would say that our pay roll at the Meridian mill (and by pay roll I mean money paid to people living in Meridian) amounts to from \$44,000 to \$45,000 a year. Our local bills paid in the city of Meridian runs to very near \$10,000 a year, and aside from the business done with Marks Rothenberg and Winner, Klein & Co. this entire amount of money is brought from north of the Ohio River, from sources which never before entered into Meridian.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if those manufacturers who have been writing here are the same ones who pay their labor an average weekly pay of \$4.10 per week in this era of high protection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman kindly tell me where he gets the figures \$4.10 a week?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. AIKEN] makes the statement, and I suppose, being from that part of the country, he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not like to discuss haphazard figures which come forward in that way, which I fear can not be substantiated.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have a statement from the Department of Commerce and Labor of North Carolina saying that the average wage scale is \$4.90, and in South Carolina it is \$4.60, and the cotton-mill scale is still lower than that.

HARKING BACK TO CLEVELAND.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the wage scale in those States is as the gentleman says, I can only express my regret that higher wages are not paid there. But if the gentleman will wait a little while I propose to take up the wage question, and I will be delighted to discuss it with him on any line he proposes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to state that if the charges made there that the leader on this side of the House will not allow the manufacturers to write this tariff bill were made in my district, it would result in strong support in favor of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for President.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to make the argument to the workingmen of the gentleman's district on that basis, and will go if the gentleman will extend me an invitation to do so.

The gentleman, writing from the Priscilla Mills, in Mississippi, said further:

My experience in the Cleveland administration was most bitter, and I sincerely trust that the present Democratic House will not repeat and force the country to experience any such period as we had at that time.

Those are pleasant recollections for those who like to discuss the labor questions as of now and then.

In conclusion, he wrote:

I trust you will pardon the length of this letter, but I feel confident that you will give the matter serious consideration and will not jeopardize the interest of your city "by a grand-stand play to the galleries," and that the blame for the high cost of living will be squarely put on the shoulders of those who should carry the burden.

Thanking you for your kindness in this matter, I remain,

Yours, truly,

W. H. McLELLAN, *Manager.*

THE MANUFACTURER TAKES THE RISK.

I also desire to introduce a voice from South Carolina. There is an appeal in this letter which seems to say, "We invested our money in good faith; we are losing upon our investment; we merely ask that we be permitted to do business and that the bread and butter be not taken out of our mouths:"

HETRICK HOSEIERY MILLS,

Walthalla, S. C., June 30, 1911.

Mr. GARNETTE ANDREWS,

Care of Richmond Hosiery Mills, Chattanooga, Tenn.

DEAR SIR: We trust that you will pardon the liberty that we are taking in writing you in reference to the tariff on hosiery and the necessity of maintaining the present tariff rate in event of a new cotton schedule being framed at the present or any future session of Congress. Being engaged in the manufacture of hosiery, even though in a comparatively small way, yet the experience we have had in the matter enables us to say without hesitation that the manufacture of hosiery in America needs the small modicum of help and protection which it obtains in the present schedule. We can scarcely live as it is, and if you will study the manufacture of hosiery in South Carolina, or, for

that matter, in any portion of the United States, you will readily perceive that there is no great margin of profit in the business of manufacture. In our own State it is estimated that not more than one mill in five of the several that we have started in the last 10 or 15 years is now running. One of the four mills in the State has recently closed, and at present there are only three mills in active operation, to wit, one at Union, one at Spartanburg, and one at Walhalla. We learned that the mill at Landrum suspended indefinitely last week.

Under the present schedule the tariff rate barely suffices to prevent the large importers in Chicago and New York from flooding the country with foreign hosiery, principally the product of cheap and underpaid European labor.

As you doubtless know, our Mr. Jaynes has been connected with the hosiery plant here in a financial way ever since the old Oconee Mill was started in 1904. Instead of his investment proving profitable, his loss has been at least 50 per cent of the total amount invested in the old plant. And such has been, in the main, the history of the manufacture of hosiery, not only in South Carolina, but throughout the South, in the last 10 years. This fact alone should invite serious investigation before making any change in the present schedule.

We believe that every Member of Congress wants to do right and promote the general welfare not only of its individual constituents, but of the whole body of American people. When you come to study this question carefully, we are sure that you will become convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that the principal profit in the hosiery business in the United States to-day is going into the pockets of the importers and jobbers, and a very small per cent into the pockets of the bona fide manufacturer, and it is the manufacturer who will be hurt by the reduction of the rate. He is to-day practically between the upper and the nether millstone, and being ground to pieces. The high price of cotton yarn and other raw material that go into the manufacture of a pair of stockings, plus the labor cost, very nearly equals the price at the best goods can be sold for to-day. We invite your careful study of this matter, and wish you and your associate Congressmen and the Senators from our State to be correctly and fully informed upon the matter before you allow any reduction of the present rate on hosiery.

NEED HELP IN THE SOUTH.

This is one of the infant industries of the South, and it certainly needs help. We also believe that it is to the vital interest of the whole South to insure the hosiery manufacturers the reasonable protection which it now obtains. While the South has the monopoly of the cotton plant, yet a pound of new lint cotton to-day is worth only 15 cents, and it has been ranging for the last five years from about 10 to 15 cents per pound. But we can readily see the great advantage the South would enjoy if the cotton grown by it could be converted into the finished article here. The hosiery that we put on the market to-day makes this pound of cotton worth from 75 cents to \$1.75. The ideal condition industrially would be to foster the enterprises which convert this raw material into the finished product, and, instead of getting 15 cents for it and shipping it out of the South, keep it at home and manufacture it into a product that would make that pound of cotton worth from 5 to 15 times the price of the raw material. For this reason, in the main, it seems to us at the present time the South is more interested than any other section of the country in maintaining the present tariff rate on hosiery.

If we are wrong in this view we would be pleased to have you set us right. You doubtless know that the manufacture of hosiery enjoys a very high reputation for clean, healthy, and desirable work for girls and women. At present fair wages only can be paid. We certainly wish we could pay more, and live, for we really desire to pay our help more if we could; but under the prevailing price of the finished product and the price of the raw material the labor cost can not be increased. A fair daily wage for operatives is now about \$1 to \$1.25 per day. You know this is not too much, and we think you will agree with us that if the tariff rate should be reduced this wage scarcely could be maintained and the manufacturers continue in business. This is putting it to you plain and is an honest confession, but it is so.

We beg to submit that the present tariff rate on hosiery is not inconsistent with the time-honored Democratic principle of a tariff revenue only. It is certainly necessary to raise money to defray the necessary expense of the Government, and there is no better or easier way to raise the revenue than by a reasonable hosiery tariff, and more especially so when it is protecting home products.

In this connection it is well to bear in mind that a reduction of the rate on hosiery would not benefit the consumer. There would be no reduction in the retail price of a pair of stockings. Such was the experience in the German-American agreement signed by President Roosevelt a few years ago. The result of that agreement was the excessive importation of foreign hosiery by the importers, who still maintain the market price of hosiery, and the retail price was maintained. The effect of the agreement was to drive the American manufacturer out of the business legally and to transfer the manufacture of hosiery to foreign countries, thus depriving our own people of a legitimate business. If the person who buys and wears a pair of stockings would be benefited by a reduction of a tariff rate there would be some reasonable ground for asking a reduction, but in the light of past experience we know this would not be the case.

AMERICANS MAKE GOOD HOSE.

The American manufacturer is now putting on the market as fine and durable a class of stockings as can be made out of cotton yarn, and the consumer is getting full value of his money. We flatter ourselves that we now have here at Walhalla and in the Piedmont section of South Carolina a hosiery plant that to-day is turning out as fine a grade of hosiery as can be made from cotton yarn. While a portion of the loss which our Mr. Jaynes sustained on the old Oconee plant was doubtless due to the lack of technical manufacturing skill of the persons in charge of the plant at first, yet two years ago he formed a connection with William A. Hetrick and Charles F. Hetrick, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., who were brought up in the knitting business in the best mills of that city, which may be reckoned as the home of the knitting industry in the United States. They removed their plant from Philadelphia to unite with the plant already here and have made it over into a practically new mill. The Hetrick brothers are expert manufacturers, and yet with their technical skill it was a struggle to keep our heads above the water and make buckle and tongue meet. We earnestly desire not to be driven out of the business. Somebody had to be pioneer in the manufacture of hosiery in this section of the South, and it fell to the lot of our Mr. Jaynes to assume the roll of such a pioneer. It can be safely said that the existence of the mill here to-day has been due to his nerve and grit in standing by the plant and maintaining it, even though it involved at one time a financial loss of \$50,000. It is doubtful whether any other man in Oconee County would have stood by

the enterprise year in and year out while it continued to lose money, but he firmly believed it to be legitimate business with the proper men at the head of the manufacturing department. He believes that a kind Providence guided his steps, and that at last the right men were found in the Hetrick brothers, of Philadelphia. They have been induced to leave their homes and kindred and friends in the "City of Brotherly Love" and make their home with the people of South Carolina, believing that in time they could achieve a reasonable success in the manufacture of hosiery at Walhalla; but we realize that it is still going to take a long time to secure the success of the enterprise, and that so far as our individual fortunes are concerned, and not ours alone, but also the welfare of the operatives in our mill, any reduction in the rate would be extremely hurtful. For these reasons we appeal to you to stand between us and disaster, believing that we have in you a strong champion to our rights.

Please let us hear from you with full expression of your views, because we wish to talk this matter to a finish and have a thorough understanding of the situation.

Awaiting your early advice, we beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

HETRICK HOSEIERY MILLS.

PROTECTION ASKED IN KNOXVILLE, TENN.

I do not intend to prolong the argument as to whether or not the Ways and Means Committee acted considerably in refusing to hear the American citizens mostly concerned in a revision of the cotton schedule, but I think it is fair to the House that we should have a few more extracts from letters which show the widespread interest in this Democratic measure and the fear that holds in the business mind with regard to it.

I quote from a letter on behalf of the Knoxville Knitting Mills Co., of Knoxville, Tenn.:

We are vitally interested in the cotton schedule affecting hosiery and other cotton products. You will appreciate the fact that the South is now becoming the center for the manufacture of cotton goods, and especially has it grown very rapidly in the manufacture of cotton hosiery.

We are using our home products, which are raised in the South and are giving employment to our southern people, which adds greatly to the development of the country and works for the good of all.

Without protection on cotton hosiery the southern mills can not compete with the foreign goods, which are made with labor which does not cost one-third as much as ours and under different conditions entirely, where living is on a different basis.

You will appreciate the fact that since a tariff has been in force the retail price on hosiery has not been advanced to the consumer in a single instance. You can still buy a 25-cent hose for 23 cents, or a 50-cent hose for 50 cents, and a 10-cent hose for 10 cents, and when you compare the value with the price you pay for same you will concede that every wearer and every user is getting his money's worth on the goods that are being offered to-day over the retail counters. In fact, a better quality of goods is to-day being given for the price than were ever offered before.

The margin of profit to the mills on hosiery is very small, and we now must have a very large production to make any profit on the business.

If foreign hosiery is allowed to come in and compete with ours, it simply gives the field to foreign goods, benefits foreign labor and foreign conditions, causing serious injury to our home people and bankrupts our home trade.

Inasmuch as it is necessary to raise a revenue, is there any better or easier way to do this than by protecting the hosiery business? In doing this you do not in any way affect the retail price of the goods to the users, but simply preserve a living margin for the manufacturers, enabling us to give employment to our home people, which, we believe you will agree, works for the good of all.

But what is the use? The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means would not listen to these gentlemen when they wanted to present the facts to the committee to prevent the striking down of this industry, which has been developing so rapidly in the South.

STARTED IN A SMALL WAY.

Here is a copy of a letter addressed to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] by the Richmond Hosiery Mills, of Rossville, Ga., June 13, 1911:

I have taken the liberty of wiring you as per the inclosed copy of telegram, as I understand a subcommittee is now at work drafting a new cotton schedule.

As manager and stockholder in four knitting mills situated at Rossville, Ga., Clinton, Tenn., Rockwood, Tenn., and Chattanooga, Tenn., I am very vitally interested in this subject. Fifteen years ago we started with \$5,000 in Chattanooga in a small way in the hosiery business. We have gradually secured additional capital, nearly every dollar of which is local capital, until now we give employment to over 2,000 persons.

Our strongest and hardest competition is from Germany, and to give you an idea of how strong this competition is we have a man in our mill from Germany whom we employ as boss dyer and to whom we pay \$50 per week, while in Germany the highest he ever received was \$10 per week. These are facts. We have knitters in our mills who earn as high as \$2 per day, while some earn as high as \$2.50. This latter figure is an exception, however. On finer work than what we make knitters earn as high as \$6 and \$7 per day, according to their skill and ability.

When we started in we made the very coarsest and cheapest grade of goods, and people said fine goods could not be made in the South; but our help has gradually evolved with the line of merchandise that we wanted to manufacture, and to-day we make as fine-gauge goods as are found in the North and East. We only started 15 years ago, and it is only a course of time when we can equal any country in the world making hosiery. Remember, we have only been in business 15 years and are one of the oldest mills in the South, whereas in Germany they have been in business for generations, and this is the competition that we are up against.

The present rates in the hosiery schedule are in reality not high enough, but we will take our chances with them. You can see the revenue that is being derived by the Treasury Department on the hosiery schedule is quite an important feature in the revenues of the Government.

WHEN ONE'S OX IS GORED.

If it would do you or your committee men any good, I should be pleased to send you samples or boxes of our merchandise, with prices at which we sell to the jobber, and if your committee desires it we will give you an itemized cost sheet, sworn to, showing you the cost of these goods. I do not believe anything could be fairer than that. We have nothing to hide; we are perfectly willing to give you any information that you may desire regarding the hosiery business, so far as in my personal power.

For the past 15 years there have been hundreds of little hosiery mills springing up all over the South, and especially in the Piedmont region. They have given employment to that class of people who heretofore have been unable to get steady work, and it would be a calamity to have this means of employment taken away from them or their wages reduced.

I have been raised in the South; born in Georgia; my father was a law partner of JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, and I ought to have nothing but low-tariff ideas in my head; but my neck is being gored now, and the anticipation of the goring is anything but pleasant, and for that reason I necessarily come before you seeking the protection that we require. We are no longer an agricultural community per se, but conditions have changed here in the South, and we are gradually becoming as much a manufacturing section as any other part of the country.

And I wish the gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD], who made his speech here a little while ago, giving us picturesque experiences of his travels around the world, were here to listen to this statement with regard to the cost of labor at home and abroad.

\$50 A WEEK HERE; \$10 IN GERMANY.

You will note that the writer says:

We have in our mill a man from Germany, whom we employ as boss dyer and to whom we pay \$50 per week, while in Germany the highest he ever received was \$10 per week.

The cost of labor equalized between this and foreign countries! The cost of labor higher in foreign countries than it is here! Here is the testimony of men who are endeavoring to build up industries in your own environment and who are obliged to pay \$50 a week for labor that was content in Germany to work for \$10 a week.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Do you class an expert chemist as a laborer?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This employee is a boss dyer. I suppose he is a specialist, but he is a workman in the mill.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. He is an expert chemist from Germany. I know the very case the gentleman refers to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad the gentleman knows it, because it does not confirm the statement made by the gentleman a little while ago in his own speech in regard to the cost of labor at home and abroad. If he knew that this boss dyer received \$10 a week in Germany and receives \$50 a week in America, he must have known there was something awry when he indicated that the cost of labor was no higher in the United States than it was in foreign countries.

Now, we will get away from the boss dyer and will take up something closer to the labor end.

You will note they say further:

We have knitters in our mills who earn as high as \$2 per day, while some earn as high as \$2.50.

These wages are paid in the mills in Georgia and Tennessee that I have just referred to.

Somebody has been fooling the House with regard to the cost of labor in the cotton mills of the country. Somebody has just been upon the outskirts listening to those who know nothing of the business. They have not gone in to examine the books, to ascertain the prices at first hand.

SOUTHERN MILLS SPEAK OUT.

The Marietta Knitting Co., of Marietta, Ga., despairing of a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee, wrote as follows:

We have written the members of the Ways and Means Committee. Most of them make the usual promise of "due consideration." The Republican members, as a rule, tell us to put in our work on the Democrats, who are wholly in control of the Ways and Means Committee work.

To the Democrats we are saying, Why reduce the tariff on hosiery when the Government is in need of the revenue and the people don't want cheaper hosiery, as they are now buying most freely hosiery that is high in price and poor in wearing quality? We refer to the sheer silks that are so popular at this time. We don't object to people buying this class of stuff if they want to, but we insist that they could get hosiery that would wear better at a cheaper price, which would be much more economical. On the idea of reducing the cost of living there certainly is no occasion for a reduction in the tariff on hosiery.

From the Orion Knitting Mills, of Kingston, N. C., I submit the following:

We agree with you that there should be no reduction, as there are too many foreign goods coming into this country already under the present schedule. The importations are so heavy that our own mills have been making very little, if any, profits for the last year or two on account of the overproduction; or, rather, the secret of it is that the consumption is too largely of foreign goods, which importers are able to bring in, even under the present schedule. To put our business on a profitable basis again there should be a slight advance in the tariff on the medium-priced goods.

UNDERWOOD BILL FAVORS THE RICH.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in his address this afternoon, referred to 150 mills that were closed down in North Carolina yesterday because of the drought. I am presenting to you mills that are closing down because of competitive conditions, not because of an act of God such as prevailed yesterday in the Catawba country.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CULLOP). Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he does not think there ought to be a revision of the cotton schedule, so far as hose is concerned, as a matter of fact?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not think there should be any reduction in the hosiery schedule.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is not a fact that during the year 1910 the poorest people of this land paid 91.23 per cent duty on their stockings, while the richest people of this country paid only 55 per cent during the year 1910? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will ask the gentleman now if he does not think that that is so unfair to the poor people of this country that it ought to be changed?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not come from a hosiery-manufacturing district, evidently.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask the gentleman if my figures are not correct?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall not attempt to confirm the gentleman's figures, nor shall I undertake to deny them, because I do not know whether his figures are correct or not. But I will say this to the gentleman: That this attempt to revise the hosiery schedule by the Ways and Means Committee is in its comparative results in favor of the man who manufactures the silk stockings as against the man in the South who has been making the 10-cent stockings for the poor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOWLER. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the poor people do pay 91.23 per cent.

DO NOT WEAR SILK STOCKINGS.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am one of the poor people who has not paid more than 25 cents for any pair of stockings he has worn within his recollection. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOWLER. I am not talking about 91 cents. I am talking about a duty of 91.23 per cent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And I do not think I shall ever desire to wear stockings at 91 cents. However, if the gentleman, coming, as he does, from an aristocratic section of Illinois, wants to wear stockings at 91 cents, evidently he has advanced to the silk-stocking class. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I regret I can not yield. I have gone thus far and covered the 91-cent proposition [laughter], and I desire in the time allotted to me to go forward and make progress. The gentleman from Illinois, I know, is going to come at me later on, and I am trying to reserve my time and my strength in order to cope with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York rose.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Later I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Now, I will read a message from the Richmond Spinning Co., of Chattanooga, Tenn.:

If these conditions keep up as they are, we could not make an honest dollar in a thousand years, and if the tariff is reduced on cotton goods, we believe it will put at least one-half of the cotton industry out of business.

Listen to this from Augusta, Ga.:

THE AUGUSTA FACTORY,
Augusta, Ga., July 31, 1911.

Mr. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Kindly use your influence as to letting the tariff on cotton goods stay just at it is, for God knows it is hard enough on the mills without any changes to their disadvantage. It is impossible for any mill in the United States to compete with the English mills in the manufacture of cotton goods, for the following reasons: Money is cheaper in England, labor is cheaper, machinery is cheaper, and the hours of labor are longer. The country using their goods is subject to secret adulteration as to the manufacturing. The Government subsidizes ships carrying the goods to their own colonies or territories. Cotton mills are losing money every day, being less protected by the tariff than any other manufacturing industry in the United States, and the only salvation for this large industry, in my opinion, is an export duty on every bale of cotton that leaves the United States. This

Idea may not be popular with the farmers, but is, nevertheless, a fact.
Yours, very truly,

STEWART PHINIZY, President.

And to this from Rock Hill, S. C.:

WYMOJO YARN MILLS,
Rock Hill, S. C., July 31, 1911.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE, M. C.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully invite your attention to Bulletins Nos. 1, 2, and 3, recently sent out by the committee on tariff and legislation of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, of Charlotte, N. C.

The movement to reduce the tariff on cotton goods at this time is a most inopportune affair, for we are just now in the midst of a depression that has existed for more than two years and which bids fair to last until the consumption of American-made goods catches up with production. We can not conceive of how a reduction can be reasonably made under present conditions.

It is our honest opinion that a reduction in the tariff at this time would mean financial ruin to our mills, for we have not made any money for over two years.

Thanking you for your attention, we are,
Yours, truly,

WYMOJO YARN MILLS.

From Carrollton, Ga., I have this:

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you no doubt know, the cotton mills of this country have traveled a rough and rocky road for several years, and this year has been the worst of all. Cotton has been very high, with yarn and cloth low in comparison. The mills are perfectly willing to pay high prices for cotton if they can make a legitimate profit on their finished product. Labor is much higher and harder to get than ever before. Several times during the past 12 months we have considered shutting down our two mills, but would not do so on account of the men, women, and children who are looking to us for a living. If the tariff on cotton goods is reduced, it will hurt not only the manufacturer, but the laborer as well.

Yours, very sincerely,

MANDEVILLE MILLS.
J. A. MANDEVILLE,
Division Manager.

And from the Echota Cotton Mills, Calhoun, Ga., this:

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If the cotton bill now pending to reduce the duties on cotton goods passes, what do you think will become of the cotton mills in the United States? What do you think will become of the several million people that are employed in the cotton mills? We can not compete with foreign labor; we do not feel that we pay our help what they should have now; but if other countries are allowed to ship their cloth into the United States at a reduced duty, what can we do but reduce wages?

The mills have had a hard pull for several years; we have been forced to run short time. Why? Because there was no demand for our goods at even money. How much cloth do we ship to Canada? Very little. How much will Canada ship us if her duty is reduced? Who of us will it hurt if we pay double the price that we now pay for cotton goods? Will it break any of us? I think not. Will it hurt the cotton-mill help if Congress forces us to reduce their pay? Will it break the mills to force them to close down?

My dear sir, I think we need more protection. We should not cause several millions of people who are depending on the mills for their bread and meat to suffer to benefit a few. I have been in the mills for 19 years, and up to a very few years ago our wages were so low that we could hardly live. Now that mill help are able to make an honest living, if this bill passes, the mills are going to be forced to cut pay.

For heaven's sake, give the poor cotton-mill help a chance to make an honest living and the mills a chance to at least play even by voting that bill down. I am a southern man, but I know what that bill will mean to the cotton mills of the United States and to her people.

Look at the wealth that is tied up in the cotton mills; look at the people that are employed by the mills.

Very truly, yours,

ECHOTA COTTON MILLS,
J. F. CLARK,
Manager and Superintendent.

A DEMOCRATIC PROTECTIONIST.

My attention, Mr. Chairman, has been called to numerous other appeals from the Southern States, but I know of none more characteristically expressive than this. Here is an extract from the copy of a letter written by a prominent Georgian to his Congressman:

I am a Democrat, but I can not afford to sit up and watch my business disappear without a strong protest * * * so you can see that sometimes we Democrats get a protection bee buzzing in our bonnet out of necessity.

Our country is developing very rapidly from a strictly agricultural country to where the manufacturing interests form quite a large and component part of our wealth, and we have reached the point where we need the same impetus to our prosperity that the New Englanders had before us. We hope you can see it in your way to safeguard our interests in the Ways and Means Committee. * * *

We don't ask you to follow the Republican doctrine of protection to equalize foreign wages and a reasonable profit. Just leave out the reasonable profit and give us the protection we need to equal foreign wages. Germany and Japan being the principal offenders—Germany right now and Japan in the future.

I know and highly respect the distinguished Member from Georgia to whom that letter was written, and I firmly believe that if free from the obligations of the Democratic caucus he would have been only too glad to respond to the call of his constituent, voicing, as he knows it does, a firm and permanent development of the Southern States.

PROFIT NOT MORE THAN 10 PER CENT.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. WARBURTON. I should just like to ask the gentleman if he believes that the whole labor cost in the mills is equal to 25 per cent of the selling price of the manufactured cotton?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do, and having posted myself somewhat on the hosiery end of the cotton business, I will say to the gentleman that so far as the manufacturing side of it is concerned, it can safely be stated that the profit does not exceed 10 per cent.

Mr. WARBURTON. The gentleman does not quite get my question. I will try and make it plainer: Will the labor cost of manufacturing cotton goods in the mills equal 25 per cent of the price that the manufacturer receives at the mill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no definite statistics upon that subject, but I will say to the gentleman, having analyzed the cost of a suit of clothes that cost \$40, that labor gets the major portion of the entire cost of the suit.

Mr. WARBURTON. That is not quite an answer to my question. What I want to know is if all of the labor in the mill costs 25 per cent of the selling price of the finished garment at the mill?

Mr. UTTER. That depends upon the style of cloth.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I should like to have the gentleman amplify his question to this extent, that when he asks for the proportion of labor cost, he should include also the cost of labor from the time of production to the finished garment, and then I would say yes, that the proportion of the labor cost is much in excess of half the value.

NO DUTY ON RAW COTTON.

Mr. WARBURTON. The gentleman understands that there is no tariff on raw cotton.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no tariff on raw cotton.

Mr. WARBURTON. The cotton is landed at the mill at home as cheaply as at the mill abroad.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is safe to say that our friends in the South can ship their cotton to Germany or to England more cheaply by vessel than they can send it by rail to New England.

Mr. WARBURTON. But there is no tariff on the cotton itself.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no tariff on cotton.

Mr. WARBURTON. Then the labor cost would be confined solely to the labor cost at the mills, would it not?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If you are discussing simply the labor cost at the mill, I presume so; but I am going to deal with the labor question in a moment or two. I do not care to have the gentleman divert me from my argument just now. I am coming to that as soon as I get through with these communications.

SHORT MESSAGES FROM THE NORTH.

A few more extracts from the expressions of those who could not obtain a hearing before the Democratic Ways and Means Committee before I proceed.

George F. Hoffman, of Hoffman-Corr Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, writes:

Every cotton mill in the South has lost money for the last two years. Cotton can be shipped from the South to England as cheap as it can be shipped to New England and can be made into goods cheaper there than it can here. There must be protection. It is a question of labor.

There is an answer to the gentleman's question now.

Joseph Feldenhelmer, of Philadelphia, chairman knitted cotton underwear tariff committee:

Our particular industry (knitted cotton underwear) is not a large one and can not be regarded as a factor as a revenue producer, but the rates which we enjoy at the present time under the Payne law, and which are exactly the same as the Dingley rates, are absolutely essential to the continued existence and progress of manufacturers engaged in our particular line.

The largest manufacturers of our class of goods are located in Massachusetts, but knitted cotton underwear is manufactured in more than one-half of the States of the Union. It is just now beginning to obtain a strong foothold in the South; as an instance, the Mayo Mills, Mayodan, N. C., are erecting at this time a mill with a capacity of 2,000 dozen underwear daily.

Brown-Aberle Co., Philadelphia:

Should the tariff be reduced on hosiery it would cause a stagnation in this business, resulting in great loss to the employer and employee alike.

Chipman Knitting Mill, Easton, Pa.:

During the last agitation of this schedule the hosiery manufacturers declared that should we be given the advance in tariff that it would not affect the price to the consumer. This declaration has been made absolutely good, as at the present time the consumers can buy better hosiery and cheaper hosiery than they have ever been able to do in the history of the business.

German-American Hosiery Co., Philadelphia:

We know how familiar you are with conditions in the hosiery industry, and that you realize the necessity of such action as much as anyone else, without going into further details on our side. The hosiery import statistics alone furnish sufficient proof how urgently our industry is in need of all the protection we now have.

Harry C. Aberle & Co., Philadelphia:

Rates of duty on hosiery in the Underwood bill will destroy the hosiery industry in this country.

Brown Knitting Co., Philadelphia:

Business on staple goods is dead and all mills are complaining since the cotton bill was reported; it is getting worse; no jobber will buy, only what he has to.

E. SUTRO & SON CO.,
Philadelphia, August 1, 1911.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wired you this morning the rates of duty on hosiery in the Underwood bill will entirely destroy the hosiery industry in this country.

We can not make our statement any stronger, so only repeat what was stated in our telegram—this undoubtedly means destruction for all of the hosiery manufacturers in this country.

Very truly, yours,

E. SUTRO & SON CO.

AN EXPRESSION FROM NEW YORK.

I think it well also at this time to introduce the following letter from Hinchman, Vezin & Co., of New York, representatives of a number of concerns in Pennsylvania and elsewhere:

HINCHMAN, VEZIN & CO.,
New York, July 29, 1911.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to say that you can state without the slightest danger of refutation that the effect would be not less disastrous than the following state of things: The closing down of three-quarters of the hosiery mills in the United States and the ruin of the owners of such mills, for their machinery and general outfit would be so much junk. If any mills at all managed to survive it would only be after a most radical cut in the wages of the operatives. The above would be the direct results. You can imagine the indirect results, how this would affect dyers, yarn spinners, makers of all the trimmings, machinery, etc., going into the manufacture of hosiery, also the indirect effects on business in general by the paralysis of this single industry.

This proposition is so obviously intended to put Mr. Taft in a hole by forcing him to give it a veto that it is a most transparent political trick, but it is a trick that works untold injury to a great industry on account of the distrust that it creates as to what may come next.

Very respectfully,

CHARLES VEZIN.

ADVANTAGES TO THE IMPORTER.

Here is a manufacturer's view of certain advantages to the importer in the matter of foreign-made goods:

THE KILBOURN KNITTING MACHINE CO.,
New Brunswick, N. J., July 31, 1911.

DEAR SIR: One advantage the importer has over the domestic manufacturer, which may not have been pointed out to you, is due to the Government bonded-warehousing arrangement, through the operation of which, we are informed, the importer may delay paying his duty for a period not exceeding three years, in addition to which he gets cheap storage for this product.

For example, the domestic manufacturer whose business requires a stock of 100,000 dozens, costing \$150,000, has the latter amount tied up in capital requirements for stock alone. The importer, however, who carries the same amount of stock, costing him, duty paid, the same amount of money, pays out less than \$1 a dozen to the German manufacturer and conducts his business on less than \$100,000 of capital. He does not pay the duty until he takes the goods out of bonded warehouse for delivery to his customers, which, of course, is not until they are sold, and his capital requirements are consequently considerably less to do the same amount of business—a somewhat hidden advantage in favor of the German manufacturers. Even with a duty of 50 per cent, he would only require approximately two-thirds the capital that would be required by the American manufacturer to conduct the same business on goods of the same value in this country, as you will see from the above.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN WYCKOFF METTLER,
Vice President.

THE WEST HEARD FROM.

Here are resolutions passed by the Middle States Textile Manufacturers' Association, Cannelton, Ind.:

MIDDLE STATES TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Cannelton, Ind., July 26, 1911.

In convention assembled at French Lick Springs, July 19, 1911, the Middle States Textile Manufacturers' Association passed the following resolution:

"First. The continued agitation of the tariff question is detrimental to the interests of all manufacturers and merchants.

"Second. That Congress should appoint a permanent tariff commission and leave the adjustment of rates entirely in the hands of this commission."

The textile interests of the United States have enough troubles to contend with without being made the goat in the revision of the tariff merely to gratify the personal ambitions of professional politicians. It is up to every manufacturer to do his part in securing a reasonable and sensible handling of tariff questions.

Yours, for action,

LEE RODMAN, Secretary.

NO APPLAUSE FOR THE INVESTORS.

These quotations and letters, Mr. Chairman, might be extended by the hundreds. They fairly represent the feeling of that great body of industrialists who have undertaken in the United States to utilize the chief staple of the South. In the census reports it appears that these men represent a combined investment, in establishments and machinery, of approximately \$800,000,000, which establishments in the various branches of cotton manufacture give employment to 370,000 wage earners, a large proportion of whom are residents of the cotton-growing district. And while the Ways and Means Committee's report traces with pride the development of cotton production in the

United States and glows with description of the process of manufacture and the growth of allied industries, there is no response to the appeals of those active and progressive forces in our industrial life who purchase the raw material and for wages and for profit fashion it into the form which brings it back to the consumer. There is, indeed, on page 5 a recital of the struggles of the Colonies to manufacture cotton and of the methods subsequently employed to protect the Colonies against England's rapacious eye for cotton and the right to knit it, but there is nowhere a sign of recognition for the Democrats and the Republicans alike, who were venturesome enough to invest their money and encourage labor in these commendable American enterprises.

WHO IS FOOLING THE WORKINGMAN?

And perhaps the reason for all this may be traced to the Democratic caucus, that caucus which has agreed to act as one man for the overthrow of the "robber baron" of industry and for the election of a nonprotection Democrat to the Executive chair. I can not quote him literally, for his speech has not been printed, but the House will recall the gallant charge of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] upon the breast-works of the Republican Party when he asserted that it was only "by fooling the workingman" with the pretense of protection that we had been able to maintain political supremacy in the United States. Have we been fooling the workingman by enacting legislation that has aided in providing employment? In the report presented by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], on page 6, there is an interesting table, which gives a comparative summary of cotton goods in the United States for the 30 years from 1879 to 1909. With the exception of the Wilson-Gorman period, these were protective-tariff years. Says the report:

This table indicates a remarkable increase in the capital invested, the number of wage earners, the amount of wages paid, value of products, the number of spindles, and the amount of cotton consumed—all combining to show the actual progress of the industry. The steady and continuous increase in the number of wage earners, spindles operated, and the quantity of cotton consumed are the best indices to the progress of the industry and especially worthy of notice. The United States now consumes approximately two-thirds of its cotton crop, which is about equally divided between the mills of the Northern and the Southern States.

A TELLTALE TABLE.

The summary is so interesting that I reproduce it in full. It is a Democratic confession that under a protective tariff system the manufacture of cotton has developed successfully both North and South; that capital invested has quadrupled in 30 years; and that the number of wage earners has doubled:

TABLE 3.—Comparative summary of cotton goods in the United States, by decades, 1879 to 1909.

Items.	Census—			
	1879	1889	1899	1909
Capital.....	\$208,280,346	\$354,020,843	\$460,842,772	\$808,287,938
Wages.....	\$42,040,510	\$66,024,538	\$85,120,310	\$129,708,088
Average number of wage earners.....	174,659	218,876	297,929	371,120
Value of product.....	\$192,090,110	\$267,981,724	\$332,806,150	\$616,297,000
Active spindles.....	10,653,435	14,188,103	19,008,352	27,383,912
Cotton consumed..... pounds	750,343,981	1,117,945,776	1,814,002,512	2,332,569,000
Cotton consumed..... bales	1,570,344	2,261,000	3,639,495	4,824,000
Looms.....	225,759	324,806	450,682	632,716
Average price upland middling cotton (cents per pound).....	12.0	11.5	7.6	14.3
Average wage per operative.....	\$240.70	\$301.65	\$285.73	\$349.67
Average value of product per operative.....	\$1,099.80	\$1,224.35	\$1,117.07	\$1,661.25
Per cent of wages paid to value of product.....	21.9	24.6	25.6	21.0
Per cent of value of cotton consumed to value of product.....	46.9	48.0	41.4	54.1

¹ Average price of upland cotton for crop.

FOURFOLD INCREASE SOUTH.

And I am sure every Republican will rejoice at the additional committee statement that in the Southern States there has been a great proportional increase in manufactures, which is conceded by this report to be 657 establishments in 1909 as against 161 establishments in 1879. The capital invested in these southern enterprises in 1879 was \$17,000,000, and the capital invested in 1909 was \$350,000,000. The gentleman from Alabama in his report shows some degree of pride in this southern development, notwithstanding the drastic action of the Democratic caucus in refusing a hearing to the cotton manufacturers, for on page 8 he says:

To show the almost incredible increase which has taken place in the industry in the Southern States it may be stated that the figures of this table indicate that the capital invested has increased more than 1,900 per cent since 1879, the spindles more than 1,750 per cent, looms

at about the same rate, the value of products more than 1,300 per cent, and the quantity of cotton consumed about 1,200 per cent.

Prior to 1880 there was relatively little cotton manufacturing south of the city of Washington, but that year a cotton exposition at Atlanta gave it a great impetus, which has continued almost uninterrupted to the present time. For example, in the three decades from 1879 to 1909 the increase in raw-cotton consumption for the world was about 150 per cent, that of the United States more than 200 per cent, while that of the Southern States increased more than 1,200 per cent. During the decade ending with 1909 the capital invested in the industry in these States increased about 185 per cent, the number of spindles about 142 per cent, looms over 500 per cent, the quantity of cotton consumed 66 per cent, and the value of products 143 per cent. The marvelous progress in recent years is the most striking feature of this great industry in America.

SOUTHERN DEVELOPMENT SURE.

Mr. Chairman, no man in this House desires more than I do to see the South develop both industrially and in the matter of agriculture. The resources of that section of our common country are rich and practically unlimited, and the surface of its wealth has only been scratched. That it is developing, and in spite of all traditions and handicaps, will continue to develop is best shown by the wonderful progress of industrial establishments in every one of the Southern States during the five years between 1904 and 1909. I append herewith extracts from such recent census reports as I have been able to obtain, showing the increase in the number of establishments and the increase in capital invested in various Southern States:

States.	Years.	Establishments.	Capital.	Number of wage earners employed.
Alabama.....	1909	3,401	\$173,479,000	72,355
	1904	1,882	105,383,000	62,173
Arkansas.....	1909	2,908	70,139,000	44,912
	1904	1,907	46,306,000	33,089
Florida.....	1909	2,156	65,128,000	57,443
	1904	1,413	32,972,000	42,091
Georgia.....	1909	4,792	202,913,000	104,582
	1904	3,219	135,212,000	92,749
Louisiana.....	1909	2,516	221,806,000	76,135
	1904	2,091	150,811,000	55,859
Maryland.....	1909	4,827	251,237,000	106,898
	1904	3,852	201,878,000	94,174
Missouri.....	1909	8,372	442,847,000	152,870
	1904	6,464	379,369,000	133,167
North Carolina.....	1909	4,930	217,183,000	121,470
	1904	3,272	141,001,000	85,339
New Mexico.....	1909	310	7,396,000	3,903
	1904	199	4,638,000	3,478
Oklahoma.....	1909	2,310	38,873,000	13,143
	1904	1,123	16,124,000	5,456
South Carolina.....	1909	1,854	173,221,000	73,046
	1904	1,399	113,422,000	59,441
Tennessee.....	1909	4,609	167,924,000	73,841
	1904	3,175	102,439,000	60,572

THEIR OWN FUNERAL.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. AKIN of New York. I notice in the quotation of letters from various portions of the United States you did not quote any from Amsterdam or from Albany, N. Y.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I had a private conversation with the gentleman from New York, in which he told me that the mills of that section had no interest in the coming bill.

Mr. AKIN of New York. And the gentleman did not quote any letters from there upon that point?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I did not seek any.

Mr. AKIN of New York. And the gentleman has not got any?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I presumed they have no concern about it, and it is their own funeral.

THE SUPPLY OF RAW COTTON.

So it is admitted that the cotton fields of the Southern States were attractive to both capital and labor, which gradually moved down from the old manufacturing centers of New England and the Middle States to be the better enabled, through proximity with the supply of raw material, to compete in the American market and for the world's trade.

The world's production of raw cotton is shown by diagrams to depend chiefly upon the production of the United States. That is to say, the world's production of raw cotton for mill consumption in 1910 was in excess of 19,000,000 bales of 500 pounds, of which the United States produced approximately 11,500,000 bales. Another census table in the report shows that of the total supply of cotton produced in the United States for the six-months period ending February 28, 1911, 49 per cent was exported, 19 per cent was consumed in the United States, and 32 per cent remained for export and domestic consumption.

For the year ending August, 1910, the proportion of the total cotton production consumed in the United States was only 39 per cent, while 52 per cent was exported and 9 per cent remained for export or local consumption. Our exports of raw cotton to be fabricated in foreign countries vastly exceeds the raw cotton sold in the United States for domestic use, but our imports of foreign raw cotton are insignificant, being for the six months period ending February 28, 1911, only 136,000 bales.

From this hurried perusal of the committee's statistics, it may be set down as definite, first, that the Southern States which grow cotton, having a monopoly of the domestic market, are disposed to maintain their trade relations with foreign manufacturers by reducing tariff duties so that manufacturers of American cotton in foreign mills may profitably return to the United States market. These are material factors which may help to determine the attitude of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee toward the American manufacturer who has had the temerity to invest his money and employ labor in the hope that he might rival his foreign competitors at least in his own country.

SPINDLES INCREASING; ALSO KNOCKS.

And yet on page 4 the Ways and Means Committee, with some degree of satisfaction, tells of the success of the American manufacturer in pushing himself into the competition. True, he does not begin to equal the foreigner in the extent of his output, but in 1900, the report says, the number of spindles in the United States was 19,472,000. This number had increased in 1911 to 29,189,000, and yet, with a virtual monopoly of raw material at our own door and with the American industrialist endeavoring to draw closer to the market for raw material, the number of spindles in the United Kingdom had grown to 53,000,000 in 1910, while in Continental Europe they had increased to 40,700,000. The proportional increase in the number of spindles was greater in the United States than it was in Great Britain or in Europe, showing an evident desire upon the part of the American worker to take the product of the South and to work it up under American conditions for both the home and the foreign market. The committee reports this progress of the hustling American industrialist, but lays in wait for the "robber baron" with a "tariff-for-revenue" club that proposes to hit every spindle in the United States and discourage every man who has gone into the race for the cotton-goods trade.

ARE WE HEADED BACKWARDS?

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is inconceivable that Representatives of the cotton-growing section should seek to choke off the domestic industries that tend to create a wider market for raw cotton. Surely we are not going backward, nor is the spirit of unrest which sometimes gives occasion for doubt as to the perpetuity of our institutions, headed toward the confiscation or destruction of property. Nor can it be our purpose, no matter what our national advantages in certain sections, that we shall labor for those whose allegiance is elsewhere, as against the interests and welfare of our own citizenship. The Democratic leaders contend that protection has served to fool the workingman. With raw cotton sure of a market, they have denied a hearing to those who are vitally interested in the cotton schedule. They have acted in seeming disregard of the workers in the mills, boldly asserting that their revision of the tariff is not for the protection of anybody, but is solely for the purpose of raising revenue. As I understand it, the revenue which runs a government comes from the body of the people, and is contributed alike by the rich and poor. By levying duties at the customhouse against foreign-made luxuries and commodities, Republicans have promoted employment for American workmen and placed the burden of taxation, not upon the poor, but upon those who preferred to spend their money in foreign countries rather than in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

WHEN HEARINGS WERE OPEN.

When the Republican Ways and Means Committee had its hearings in 1908, there were many spokesmen from cotton-growing States who appeared in favor of a duty upon cotton. They sought, in particular, to have a duty levied upon foreign imports of cotton with the view of developing sea-island cotton. They told the country of the deplorable wage conditions that prevailed in the cotton fields, and they pleaded for the retention of such duties as would widen both the demand for cotton and cotton manufactures. Now, in spite of all the progress that has been made and of the protection sentiment that has been attracting capital and industry into the Southern States, we are told by the Democratic leaders that we must have more imports of foreign commodities and less domestic manufactures.

WORKINGMEN DEMANDED INCREASE.

I well recall a meeting in my own district when the effort was made to increase the Dingley law rates upon hosiery. We had undertaken to rival the German and British makers, but owing to their cheap and superior facilities for manufacture and partly because of an existing trade agreement in which they had the best of it, the American market was being flooded with hosiery from abroad. Our mills were running upon half time, and at the meeting referred to no less than 2,000 working men and women appeared, many of them coming as representatives from the mills in New England and the South. They asked then that the rates of duty be increased so that the difference in overhead charges and labor cost might be covered and the American workman put in a fair way to compete with the foreign workman. Their sentiments were subsequently embodied in a petition which bore 10,000 signatures, which they brought to Washington as a demand for protection against wage reduction and slack work.

But the gentleman from Alabama declares that the Republican Party has kept itself in power by deceiving the American workman. We have insisted that the protective system has advanced the wage of the American worker and has given him a better standard of living than his foreign competitors enjoy. The taunt of the gentleman from Alabama has been echoed by many speakers upon the other side, who demand the overthrow of protection. It is therefore fair to present to the House some facts which the gentlemen upon the other side do not apparently desire to present to the workingman of the country.

SOME SERIOUS LABOR FACTS.

In the bulletin of the Bureau of Labor for March, 1911, is an abstract of the British Board of Trade report to the Government. It gives the predominant range of weekly wages in certain selected trades in England and Wales, Germany, France, Belgium, and Great Britain. A perusal of these figures will help to explain the reason for sending American cotton abroad to be made up into cheap garments to be returned for consumption in the United States. I append them herewith:

Predominant range of weekly wages in certain occupations in specified industries, by countries.

[Compiled from reports of an inquiry by the board of trade into working-class rents, housing, and retail prices, together with rates of wages in certain occupations in the principal industrial towns of the United Kingdom, 1908; Germany, 1908; France, 1909; Belgium, 1910; United States, 1911.]

Countries.	Predominant range of weekly wages.			
	Building trades.			
	Bricklayers.	Stonemasons.	Carpenters.	Joiners.
England and Wales (excluding London).....	\$9.12-\$9.85	\$9.04-\$9.57	\$8.80-\$9.57	\$8.80-\$9.57
Germany (excluding Berlin).....	6.55- 7.00	(*)	6.55- 7.00
France.....	5.25- 7.02	5.25- 7.02	5.84- 7.36	5.78- 6.43
Belgium.....	5.05- 5.84	(*)	4.91- 6.14	4.97- 5.70
United States.....	26.77-30.42	23.42-26.77	16.73-21.90	16.73-21.90

Countries.	Building trades.			
	Plasterers.	Plumbers.	Painters.	Hod carriers and bricklayers' laborers.
England and Wales (excluding London).....	\$8.88-\$10.14	\$8.60-\$9.67	\$7.66-\$9.12	\$5.92-\$6.57
Germany (excluding Berlin).....	5.84- 6.93	5.84- 7.02	5.21- 6.43	3.85- 4.83
France.....	5.78- 7.06	5.84- 7.02	5.21- 6.43	3.85- 4.83
Belgium.....	5.01- 5.96	4.91- 5.70	4.56- 5.25	3.65- 4.38
United States.....	24.33-29.00	21.29-27.37	15.82-20.68	12.17-16.73

Countries.	Engineering trades.			
	Fitters.	Turners.	Smiths.	Pattern makers.
England and Wales (excluding London).....	\$7.79-\$8.76	\$7.79-\$8.76	\$7.79-\$8.76	\$8.27-\$9.25
Germany (excluding Berlin).....	6.33- 7.79	6.57- 8.03	6.93- 8.03	6.20- 7.30
France.....	5.84- 7.02	5.84- 7.42	6.12- 7.73	6.20- 7.24
Belgium.....	4.81- 5.56	4.99- 5.92	4.89- 5.96	4.77- 5.84
United States.....	15.41-18.13	15.41-18.13	16.47-20.76	18.13-22.30

* Including stonemasons.

* Included in bricklayers.

Predominant range of weekly wages, etc.—Continued.

Countries.	Engineering trades.	Printing trade: Hand compositors (job work).
	Laborers.	
England and Wales (excluding London).....	\$4.38-\$5.35	\$6.81-\$8.03
Germany (excluding Berlin).....	4.38- 5.35	6.02- 6.31
France.....	3.79- 4.06	5.56- 7.02
Belgium.....	3.14- 3.95	4.68- 5.56
United States.....	9.12-10.65	16.73-19.77

Reduced to plain English which every one of us may readily understand, this compilation means that on the average the workingman who receives \$2.43 in the building trades in the United States receives \$1 abroad; that the man who receives \$2.13 in the engineering trades in the United States, receives \$1 abroad, and that the man who receives \$2.46 as a printer or compositor in the United States, receives \$1 abroad.

COMPARISONS CARRIED FURTHER.

These figures which come from official British sources are so plainly indicative of the necessity for an American barrier to protect labor "that he who runs may read." But this British board of trade report goes into the relative cost of living, and the housing conditions of the working people of the several countries specified, and what the London Times had to say upon this phase of the question is illuminating. I quote the Times as follows:

The broad upshot of the reports dealing with European countries, including our own, has been to show that in regard to the conditions investigated the artisan in this country has, in a varying degree, the advantage over his fellows in Germany, France, or Belgium. He earns somewhat higher wages, works somewhat shorter hours, and pays somewhat less for the necessities of life. Without going into qualifying details or minor distinctions we may accept that as the broad result. But when we come to the United States the picture is turned almost completely around. From the abstract which we publish to-day the reader will see that the workman in America enjoys an enormous advantage over his fellow in England, an advantage far greater than the latter enjoys over the German or the Frenchman. He earns more than two and a quarter times as much money and works shorter hours for it; so that his hourly rate of earnings is as 240 to 100, or pretty nearly twice and a half as much. Against that enormous difference in wages there is something to be set in the way of expenditure. Rent is twice as high and food is about one-third higher than in England, but the cost of living altogether is only as 152 to 100, or about half as much again.

Now, these facts completely dispose of two widely current misconceptions or misstatements. One is that the higher wages admittedly paid in America are all swallowed up and more by the higher cost of living, which is believed to surpass the standard of this country in regard to the necessities of life by an enormous amount, and to constitute an intolerable burden. The present report explicitly states the contrary at the conclusion of a long, elaborate, and extremely careful comparison of the two countries. In the United States, it says, a much greater margin of earnings over cost of living is available, even when allowance has been made for the increased expenditure on food and rent. "The margin is clearly large, making possible a command of the necessities and conveniences and minor luxuries of life that is both nominally and really greater than that enjoyed by the corresponding class in this country."

WHICH WOULD YOU HAVE?

Which would you rather have, my friends on the Democratic side, the English, French, or German system? These are authentic figures carefully compiled by a great nation. Supplementing this official statement, I challenge a denial from any man in this House who has been in England and observed for himself. I never have seen in the streets of New York, Philadelphia, or Savannah conditions of the human kind so deplorable as those I have seen in London, Liverpool, and Manchester. Choose for yourself. The workingman is able to choose for himself, and it is the secret of his desire to leave the old country and come to this.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will, although my time has nearly expired.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN TEXAS.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I understand the gentleman to take the position that laborers in the industries not protected are doing as well as those in the industries that are protected. Does not that show that protection does not favor the laborers to any extent?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Our contention is that everyone is benefited by protection. When we have protection, we benefit the Democrat in spite of himself, and also the Socialist.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It is easy to contend that; but is it not a fact that the laborers in the industries not protected are in a better condition than those in the classes that are protected?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In some trades, yes; in some trades, no. In the building trades, if you say they are not protected, I say to you they are better paid. If you will take up the cotton fields, where they have no protection upon raw cotton, I will say they are not so well paid.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that the trouble with the cotton mills in the South is the labor is so much better paid on the plantation than in the cotton mills that they can not keep their employees?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, so long as the gentleman has raised the question, I will take occasion, although I had not intended to do it, to read from the hearings of the old Ways and Means Committee, page 4455, a statement by Mr. John C. Cawfield, of Stockdale, Tex., asking for a tariff upon cotton. He said:

We see by the tariff that almost every branch of industry but the cotton raiser is protected against pauper labor. Those engaged in producing cotton consist of millionaires—

MILLIONAIRES DOWN SOUTH.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say this and have it repeated in this House, because the inference has always been—and these are my own words—that the only millionaires were the men engaged in the industries, but here is a gentleman who actually observes that—

those engaged in producing cotton consist of millionaires, who own thousands of acres of land, down to the man who is so poor that he does not own a weeding hoe.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact then—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman does not want me to read this I will cease reading, because I had not any desire to read it.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I judge from what the gentleman has read that the witness states that those who produce cotton are some of them millionaires and some of them so poor they hardly own a hoe.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the way I interpret it.

Mr. RANDELL OF Texas. All classes, so far as wealth is concerned, are engaged in cotton raising.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I so interpret it. I understand the witness to say that—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, being in control of the time on this side of the House, as I understand it, I will extend the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for an indefinite period, and I hope he will not be too long. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will understand that we would be very glad to stay here and listen indefinitely to him, but there are gentlemen on this side who desire to be heard to-night.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I endeavored to get an agreement from the gentlemen on the other side before we began this discussion, but was utterly unable to do so, and so I proceeded ex parte.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will inform the gentleman that we ask for only one hour on this side this evening.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman surely would not close me off on a discussion about so important a matter as this when we have just reached the cotton fields of Texas.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I would not do it if I had the power, but I hope the gentleman will remember that there are gentlemen on this side who desire to be heard and that he will not be too lenient in extending time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Much of my time has been taken by questions which I tried to answer, although I did not answer the gentleman from New York on one occasion when he asked me to yield. I will try to get through in half an hour.

I was saying to the gentleman from Texas that it was a surprising statement to those of us who come from the northern tier—and I say that, of course, without sectional feeling—to find that there were in the South, which so belabors certain other sections of the country where men acquire wealth, certain people who were classed as millionaires.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly.
KNOWS BUT ONE RICH MAN.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I know of but one millionaire cotton raiser in Texas—there may be others—and he is the distinguished brother of the President, and he does not live in Texas.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the brother of the President has the good judgment to go down to a fertile country and work his way up in it. I am endeavoring to get other men to go there, and all that I ask is that they be properly protected when they go there. I do not think I shall pursue this discussion about millionaires, but I

will quote a little further from the testimony of this gentleman who came up from Stockdale, Tex., asking protection for cotton. Now, getting away from the millionaire question, he said, and it is only fair, since the question has been raised, that this should go into the RECORD:

The laborers who actually produce the cotton do not receive on an average more than 75 cents per day for men; women and children, 37½ cents per day.

WOMEN IN THE FIELDS.

Now, we hear a great deal about women and children working in the mills, but it now appears that they work in the cotton fields and get 37½ cents a day. The witness further says:

The children of these families in scholastic age do not attend school, on an average, more than two months in the year, which the enrollment and daily-attendance roll will show.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. As a matter of fact I am a farmer myself and I know that statement in reference to wages is entirely false. The fact of the matter is the cotton fields take the labor away from the cotton mills in my district. They take away the workmen from the mills in the spring and fall when they chop and pick cotton. The labor is taken away from these mills and that is the main trouble.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have hesitated to bring this statement forward, but the gentleman raised the question himself. If the gentleman tells me that the statement is false I accept it, but I expect him to accept my statement that much of this talk in regard to poverty wages paid in the North is also false. Let us be fair with one another. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, let us go on.

I was beginning to quote from the Bureau of Labor showing the increase of wages in the United States and the reduction in the hours of labor. I know some men who preach the labor doctrine, some men who claim to be the best friends of the working men, some men who stand out always in the limelight and have an awful time lifting the "iron heel of the tyrant from the neck of the wretched," may dispute these figures, but I think the sensible, everyday working man, whether he belongs to the union or whether he does not, will accept the statement as it comes from the Bureau of Labor with regard to the improved conditions which prevail in this country over those that prevail in others.

ALL CLASSES BENEFITED BY PROTECTION.

Nor is this all there is to be said upon the subject. The Republican Party has not deceived the working man, but has closely watched his interests in every protective measure. The bulletin of the Bureau of Labor for July, 1908, presents an article showing the gradual increase in wages in the United States and the gradual reduction of hours of labor from the average rate paid in the decade between 1890 and 1899, and the year 1907. These were all protection years and it will be noted in the table presented herewith that so-called nonprotected trades shared proportionately with the so-called protected trades, thus demonstrating the general benefits and advantages of protection:

Per cent of increase or decrease in wages per hour and in hours of labor per week in 1907 as compared with the average for 1890–1899, by industries.

Industries.	Wages per hour.		Hours per week.	
	Per cent of increase.	Per cent of decrease.	Per cent of increase.	Per cent of decrease.
Agricultural implements.....	30.9	3.7
Bakery, bread.....	28.9	8.4
Blacksmithing and horseshoeing.....	26.4	5.9
Boots and shoes.....	24.3	4.0
Brick.....	22.7	1.5
Building trades.....	44.6	9.4
Candy.....	24.4	(1)	(1)
Carpets.....	17.1	1.4
Carriages and wagons.....	18.3	4.0
Cars, steam railroad.....	24.4	4.1
Clothing, factory product.....	15.8	3.3
Cotton goods.....	57.5	3.2
Dyeing, finishing, and printing textiles.....	11.37
Electrical apparatus and supplies.....	22.6	6.7
Flour.....	16.0	3.3
Foundry and machine shop.....	21.4	5.4
Furniture.....	27.1	4.3
Gas.....	7.7	3.9
Glass.....	29.4	1.4
Harness.....	23.5	4.1
Hats, fur.....	26.4	8.4
Hosiery and knit goods.....	33.4	2.3
Iron and steel, bar.....	40.4	2.1
Iron and steel, Bessemer converting.....	32.6	9.5
Iron and steel, blast furnace.....	19.8	0.6
Leather.....	11.81
Liquors, malt.....	32.9	13.0

¹ No change.

Per cent of increase or decrease in wages, etc.—Continued.

Industries.	Wages per hour.		Hours per week.	
	Per cent of increase.	Per cent of decrease.	Per cent of increase.	Per cent of decrease.
Lumber.....	27.6	3.1
Marble and stone work.....	25.7	6.4
Paper and wood pulp.....	33.3	10.2
Planing mill.....	24.6	3.6
Pottery.....	13.82
Printing and binding, book and job.....	31.0	9.9
Printing, newspaper.....	22.6	5.2
Shipbuilding.....	20.9	4.3
Silk goods.....	16.9	2.4
Slaughtering and meat packing.....	16.0	(1)	(1)
Streets and sewers, contract work.....	45.7	7.3
Streets and sewers, municipal work.....	21.6	9.5
Tobacco, cigars.....	32.45
Woolen and worsted goods.....	31.9	2.0
All industries.....	28.8	5.0

(1) Not reported.

ADVANCE IN LABOR'S WAGE.

This is a long list of specified occupations which have been beneficiaries of improved labor conditions in the United States, due to the operation of the protective tariff system, due to the influence of the labor unions, due to the consideration of the lawmaking bodies, and due to the tolerance and the consideration of the employer of labor, and the average increase in wages in all these trades during this period of years was 28.8 and the average reduction in hours was just 5 hours per week. Is there such a condition, may I ask, Democrats or even Republicans, prevailing in any country in the world as prevails in the labor field in the United States? And these conditions are the product of protective-tariff years.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to his colleague?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that the gentleman takes these figures from the report of the Bureau of Statistics relative to wages during the past 10 years?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Bureau of Labor, July, 1908. Wages increased, hours of labor decreased during the average as between the decade from 1890 and 1899 and 1907—substantially a period of 17 years.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Did the gentleman at the same time take from the same source the average increase in the cost of living? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am very glad some one on that side applauds that statement, because I have just quoted the British Board of Trade report showing that there is an increase in the cost of living on that side. I am sufficiently informed upon current events to say that the increase in the cost of living has not been special to the United States, but has been world-wide and every country has been equally affected. [Applause on the Republican side.]

INFLUENCE OF LABOR UNIONS.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman knows that the same report he quotes from in regard to the average increase of wages also makes statements relative to the average increased cost of living during the same period of time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman's question, and I think I have answered it. I say that the increase in the cost of living has not been special to the United States, but has been world-wide. But I will say to the gentleman that while I intend to say a little more about the cost of living before long, there is no country in the world where the people have been buying such fine hosiery, such luxuries, such good clothing, and where they have been living so well, and where they have been using up so many automobiles as in the United States.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman also quotes the average increase in wages and the average reduction in hours in various trades in the United States. Does the gentleman know of any trade in this country where the hours of labor have been reduced, whether a protected trade or otherwise, where a labor organization has not been responsible for the decrease in the hours of labor?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman, before I answer his question, how many working people there are in the United States?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Do you mean wageworkers?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I mean people who earn their living by the sweat of their brow. How many of them are

there altogether? We have 92,000,000 of population; how many of them earn a living?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I have not the figures exact as to the number that earn a living.

WORKERS ORGANIZED AND UNORGANIZED.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman is an expert in labor matters, and I respect his opinion. I appreciate all he is doing for labor. I would like to know, because he ought to know, how many men and women there are in the United States who work for a living.

Mr. BERGER. Thirty-one million.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania accept those figures?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know how many men and women work for a living, but I do know that the great bulk of men and women and children over 12 years of age work for a living in the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose we accept 30,000,000 as the actual number who work for a living in the United States and use that as the basis, will you tell me how many people are enlisted under the banner of organized labor in the United States?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. There are somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 wage earners who are in labor organizations.

Mr. BERGER. Two and one-half millions.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. There are over 2,000,000 who are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and then there are, in addition to that, a number of trade unionists that are not affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, such as the railroad employees. There are about 3,000,000 of them. The point I ask the gentleman is this: Does he know of any trade in this country where the hours of labor have been reduced except through the efforts of a labor organization?

LABOR'S RIGHT TO ORGANIZE.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman, because I am as much a friend of the labor unions as he is, although he is much more active, that his answer to my question answers his own. If there are but 3,000,000 organized laborers in the United States and there are 30,000,000 laborers, it does not follow that the increase in the wages or the decrease in the hours of labor have been wholly due to the influence of the 3,000,000. But I will say this to the gentleman, that wherever the 3,000,000 have had their influence, and wherever they have been wisely organized and kept within proper bounds, observing the law, following out those principles for which they were organized, going about it upon a reasonable basis, they have contributed to the reduction of the hours of labor and they have contributed to the increase in wages. And I will say more to the gentleman; if self-respecting laborers, organized for the purpose of mutual benefit and advancement, were to organize more thoroughly and stand together more compactly, which they have an equal right to do, with the manufacturers or employers in the land, and proceed in order, they would succeed in further improving the labor conditions in the United States, in increasing the wages, and in reducing the hours. But the gentleman knows as well as any man upon this floor that it is because of lack of organization, it is because of leadership that often becomes selfish and arrogant, it is because after an advantage has been obtained by one separate union, or for one man in a union, and the dues begin to fall off, the union falls back and loses its power. The gentleman knows full well that where the union goes forward and conducts itself in lawful manner and acts with reason it can improve and does improve labor conditions.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield further to his colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

ATTITUDE OF EMPLOYERS.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that manufacturers as a rule, or employers as a rule, will not pay any higher wages or give any better conditions of employment than the market conditions of labor compel them to give?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be conceded, but I have had a long-standing belief that organized labor sometimes fixes at a minimum the earning capacity of a member of the union, because it prevents his individuality and incentive from making itself known to the employer, and instead of the union being a real factor in enabling him to advance and improve his condition, he is by reason of his very environment and his obligation to the union, making himself a mere cog in the wheel, and establishing a low standard, from which by his union he is prevented from rising, except as all rise in a body—this especially as to unskilled labor.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows from personal experience that in any large industrial establishment, even where there is no labor organization in existence, the employer himself makes a uniform standard for the different grades of workingmen, irrespective of what the capacity of the individual workingman may be, and the union has to deal with that uniform standard when it comes to make a wage scale with the employer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not always. I think that where the representatives of the union confer with the employer, the committee stands for the body of the workingmen and fixes the terms, and thus the workingman accepts them with the knowledge of the union, and each individual becomes part of the machine, subject to the committee, and thereby sinks his individuality to that extent.

TARIFF HELPS THE EMPLOYED.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman knows anything about the making of wage agreements, he must know that the labor organizations do not insist upon a uniform rate for the men, but that they do stand for a minimum rate and do not care how much above that the employer pays.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And I presume by the same token that the committee representing the union stands for the maximum and then accepts a compromise.

Now, I think, as my time is passing rapidly, I had better proceed. I want to say, however, just one more word to my friend from Pennsylvania, and that is that while the labor conditions in the United States are better than they are abroad, due to the tariff, the unions, and other conditions, still, laboring men, so far as the influence of the union to improve their conditions is concerned, are better organized in Great Britain than in the United States. Hence I ask, Why is not their condition better in Great Britain than it is here?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman want me to answer his question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman desires an answer I will give it to him.

ENGLISH LABOR ORGANIZED BUT POORLY PAID.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I must go on if I am to get through in the 10 minutes that are left to me. If the gentleman will reply to my question in a single answer, I will yield to him. Is it not a fact that in proportion to population the men organized in the unions of Great Britain are better organized than those in the United States?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. There are two parts to the question. They are better organized in England than in the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then why is their condition not better there than it is here?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Because in the United States the average productivity of the workingman is \$2,400 per annum, while in England the average productivity of the workingman is \$556 per annum. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for that statement, because it refutes statements and assertions repeatedly made by gentlemen on the other side with regard to the relative efficiency of European and American workingmen. I call on gentlemen to witness the testimony of a half dozen Members who have spoken on the other side, who have asserted that the skill of workingmen abroad was of a higher grade than that of workingmen in the United States. I thank the gentleman, because he speaks with authority, from the standpoint of the union man.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield further to his colleague?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I regret that I must hurry along.

AMERICAN WAGES SWORN TO.

And while we are considering the action of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee in refusing hearings to interested parties, let us recall the many months of public hearings accorded in 1908 by the Ways and Means Committee of which the Republican, Mr. PAYNE, was chairman. Hundreds of witnesses appeared and thousands of communications and petitions were considered before the committee framed its report. Among other important data to be found in those proceedings are a series of affidavits, not mere petitions, but sworn statements, as to the cost of labor in the hosiery trade in the United States. It is not necessary to reproduce all of these affidavits—they may be found in volume 32 of the Tariff Hearings of 1908—but I shall present two of them which show the American standard of wages, which is twice that of England

and two-thirds more than that in Germany. Let these affidavits speak for themselves:

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
County of Philadelphia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, residing at Philadelphia, in and for said county and State, Reinhard Huettig, secretary and manager of the German-American Hosiery Co., a corporation of Philadelphia, Pa., who, being duly sworn according to law, says that the following list of wages paid at the present time at the hosiery mill of the above corporation at Philadelphia, Pa., was copied from the weekly pay roll of the said German-American Hosiery Co., and are true and correct both as to the weekly averages and piecework earned by the different classes of operators; that to the best of his knowledge and belief there is no material difference between the wages paid for the same kind of work in the different sections of the United States, and that the following schedule of rates for piecework and the list of weekly averages constitute a fair basis for calculating the cost in the hosiery factories of the United States of such lines of goods as are coming in most direct competition with foreign, and especially German, goods:

(1) Average weekly wages paid:

Knitters (men).....	
Legging machines.....	\$30.00
Footing machines.....	23.00
Toppers (women).....	8.50
Seamers (women).....	12.50
Loopers (women).....	11.00
Menders (women).....	9.50
Finishers (men).....	16.00
Finishers (women).....	8.50

(2) Rates paid for piecework.

	Ladies' hose.	
	For 33 gauge.	For 35 gauge.
Knitting legs.....	\$0.19	\$0.22
Knitting feet.....	.10	.11
Topping.....	.06	.06
Looping.....	.065	.065
Seaming.....	.07	.08
Mending.....	.04	.04
Boarding.....	.04	.05
Pressing.....	.01	.01
Pairing and folding.....	.04	.04
Other wages and salaries.....	.125	.125
Total.....	.74	.80

That the foregoing facts are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

REINHARD HUETTIG.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 24th day of November, A. D. 1908.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM J. GEGGIS,
Notary Public.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
County of Philadelphia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, residing at Philadelphia, in and for said county and State, Thomas E. Brown, president of the Brown Knitting Co., a corporation of Philadelphia, Pa., who, being duly sworn according to law, says: That the following list of wages paid at the present time at the hosiery mill of the above corporation at Philadelphia, Pa., was copied from the weekly pay roll of the said Brown Knitting Co., and are true and correct, both as to the rates paid for piecework and as to the weekly averages earned by the different classes of operators; that the rates have been in force since April, 1907, and have not been reduced since then; that to the best of his knowledge and belief there is no material difference between the wages paid for the same kind of work in the different sections of the United States, and that the following schedule of the rates for piecework and the list of weekly averages constitute a fair basis for calculating the cost in the hosiery factories of the United States of such lines of goods as are coming in most direct competition with foreign, and especially German, goods:

(1) Average weekly wages paid:

Knitters (men).....	\$31.00
Toppers (women).....	8.00
Loopers (women).....	9.50
Seamers (women).....	10.00
Menders (women).....	10.00
Finishers (women).....	9.00
Finishers (men).....	14.50

(2) Rates paid for piecework for 33-gauge ladies' hose:

Knitting legs.....	.26
Knitting feet.....	.14
Topping feet.....	.08
Looping.....	.07
Seaming.....	.075
Examining and mending.....	.04
Boarding.....	.06
Pairing and packing.....	.075
Other wages and salaries.....	.15

Total wages per dozen..... .95

That the foregoing facts are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

THOS. E. BROWN.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 24th day of November, A. D. 1908.

[SEAL.]

GEO. E. GRIFFIN, Notary Public.

That is enough to show the average, and I am going to ask the gentlemen upon the other side who worry about the wages paid in the mills to compare those wages paid to women work-

ing in the mills with the wages of school-teachers in the common schools, who have to acquire an education to teach the young idea of this country its duties in citizenship.

DECLINED TO VISIT THE MILLS.

So far as the hosiery branch of the cotton business is concerned, I desire to say that, notwithstanding the special assaults that have been made upon the Payne rates, even an invitation to members of the Ways and Means Committee to investigate the cost of production at the mills was not accepted. The Knitted Cotton Underwear Association was equally desirous of being heard, and, if need be, investigated. I submit a brief which this association laid before the committee:

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,

Chairman Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The knitted cotton underwear manufacturers' tariff committee of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers submit for the consideration of the Ways and Means Committee the following pertaining to their industry:

The present tariff rate under the Payne-Aldrich law is exactly the same as under the Dingley law, there having been no change or increase of rates whatsoever.

At the time of the tariff hearing before the Committee of Ways and Means in the House of Representatives, Sixtieth Congress, our committee stated the following facts, which we deem worthy of repetition.

"There has never been a trust or combination formed by the manufacturers of knitted cotton underwear for the purpose of controlling either output or selling price, the nature of the business being such that it can be engaged in by small manufacturers with limited means in almost any community.

"The average rate of wages paid to skilled women sewing-machine operators in the United States varies from \$1.50 to \$2 per day. The same class of labor in France, Germany, and Switzerland receives from 30 cents to 50 cents per day.

"Wages paid winders or spoolers in the United States varies from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per day. The same class of labor in the countries named receives from 35 cents to 40 cents per day.

"Wages paid knitters in the United States varies from \$1.25 to \$2 per day. The same class of labor in the countries named receives from 35 cents to 75 cents per day.

"The items of labor entering into the manufacture of cotton knitted underwear, over and above the actual cost of the staple, represents fully 75 per cent of the total."

For some years past the bulk of imports of knitted cotton underwear has been comparatively small, owing to the rapid development of the industry in the United States as well as the steady improvement of the domestic product.

The number of concerns engaged in the making of knitted cotton underwear having practically doubled in the past 10 years, has brought about the keenest and strongest possible competition, and as a result the consumer has been enabled to buy superior domestic-made garments and has never suffered to the slightest extent as a result of the existing tariff rates, which we believe are as low as they should be with the existing American standard of wages.

As an example, we cite the chief item of import, which is represented by a garment sold to the consumer at 50 cents each. These goods are sold in France at 12½ francs, or \$2.50 per dozen, and can be landed and sold at any eastern port of entry in the United States at \$4 per dozen. Similar goods made in the United States are sold, plus a profit of 7½ per cent, at about \$3.85 per dozen, illustrating the small factor of safety left to the domestic manufacturer.

This committee is in a position to demonstrate that the difference in the cost of labor between the foreign and domestic articles mentioned is at least \$1.35 per dozen, whereas the protection afforded by the present tariff law amounts to \$1.45 per dozen.

It is our firm belief that it will be to the best interest of the consumer and the wage earners employed in our industry, and to the knitted-goods manufacturers in the United States, as well as those engaged in the spinning of cotton yarns in the South, and other dependent industries representing nearly every State in the Union, that the present schedule of duties should be maintained.

Respectfully submitted.

C. B. BAKER,
EDWARD H. CLIFT,
ANDREW FREY,
LINCOLN CROMWELL,
GEORGE W. KAVANAUGH,
JOHN C. VAN DE WATER,
P. H. HANES, JR.,
JOS. FELDENHEIMER,

Chairman.

RESOLUTIONS FROM COTTON STATES.

To this plain statement of the inequalities of foreign and domestic manufactures and wages may be added the following resolution, which comes up from the Carolinas and Virginia:

CAROLINAS AND VIRGINIA HOSEIERY ASSOCIATION,
Raleigh, N. C., June 30, 1911.

At a meeting, held June 24 at the Monticello Hotel, of the Hosiery Manufacturers of North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved, That a reduction in rates of duty on hosiery would add another burden to those we now have to contend with, such as high price of cotton, strong home competition, and depression resulting from tariff agitation.

"It is the sense of this convention, composed of hosiery manufacturers in North Carolina and Virginia, that cotton should be used in our mills instead of going abroad to provide employment for foreign workers, which would be the case if duties were lowered.

"For these reasons we respectfully request the Members of Congress and of the Ways and Means Committee especially not to disturb the rates of duty on hosiery."

C. McL. CARR, President.
ERNEST MARTIN, Secretary.

THE HOSEIERY TRADE AFFECTED.

In the hosiery trade, to which the foregoing communication applies and to which I shall direct the attention of the House

for a few moments, we find upon consulting the report of the Ways and Means Committee (p. 55) that the imports of the popular makes amounted, under the Payne bill, up to June 30, 1910, to over \$6,000,000. The duties exceeded \$4,300,000. The chairman of the committee insists that the rate of duty, which was equivalent to 71.57 per cent, was too high, and yet, in spite of the fact that on certain grades of hosiery the unit foreign value per dozen was 87 cents, the labor value alone in the United States would have been 74 cents. To prevent the American manufacturer from making any profit between his labor cost of 74 cents—to say nothing of all the other charges—and the 87 cents of foreign selling value, the gentleman from Alabama proposes to lower the duty from 71.57 per cent to 35 and 40 per cent ad valorem, so that importations may be increased and the duties reduced. In other words, the Underwood bill proposes to cut off \$3,000,000 of revenue on the entire cotton schedule by increasing the importation of foreign hosiery from \$6,000,000 to nearly \$8,000,000 of value; and, on hosiery alone, to reduce the revenue from \$4,300,000 to \$3,100,000, a net reduction on this item of \$1,200,000.

SUPPRESSING THE HOSEIERY MAN.

I append the Democratic plan of suppressing the American manufacturer, and commend it most heartily to the careful consideration of the American workingman as well as to the American taxpayer:

On stockings, hose and half-hose, selvedged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless stockings, hose and half-hose, and clocked stockings, hose and half-hose, on all of the above composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, finished or unfinished, 40 per cent ad valorem. On men's and boys' cotton gloves, knitted or woven, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Item.	Present act— Results for year ending June 30, 1910.	Proposed act— Estimated re- sults for a 12- month period.
Imports.....	\$6,059,663.64	\$7,972,500.00
Duties.....	\$4,336,858.86	\$3,168,800.00
Equivalent ad valorem rate.....per cent..	71.57	40 and 35

CONSUMERS' PRICES DO NOT CHANGE.

It is commonly stated in the trade, and I believe it to be true, that there is little variation in the price of hosiery to the consumer at any time, tariff or no tariff, so that there is no warrant in attacking this item because of increased living cost. In fact, it is asserted that the 1911 prices are somewhat lower than they were in 1901, notwithstanding the increase of about 100 per cent in the cost of yarn and a general advance in wages. The accompanying statement is intended to show the relationship of the manufacturer of hosiery to the jobber and consumer with respect to price:

Prices at which seamless hose are sold to the consumer, per dozen:

\$1.20 \$1.50 \$1.80 \$3.00

Manufacturers' selling prices to the wholesaler or jobber, per dozen:

Dingley law—1901—

\$0.62 \$1.00 \$1.05 \$1.35

Payne law—1911—

.62 .82½ .95 1.35

.92½ .97½ 1.50

.95 1.60

1.00 1.71

1.75

Prices at which fashioned hose are sold to the consumer, per dozen:

\$3.00 \$4.20 \$6.00 \$9.00 \$12.00

Manufacturers' selling prices to the wholesaler or jobber, per dozen:

1901—

\$1.85 \$2.37½ \$3.25 \$6.00

1.88 2.40 3.50 6.50

1.87½

1.95

2.00

1911—

1.70 2.35 3.10 \$4.50 6.50

1.77 3.35

1.82½ 3.40

3.50

The selling prices of the retailer never change, always being 25 cents,

35 cents, 50 cents, 75 cents, and \$1 for fashioned hose, and 10 cents,

12½ cents, 15 cents, 20 cents, and 25 cents for seamless hose.

GERMAN INROADS CHECKED.

Without attempting or desiring to confuse the House with regard to the technicalities of the hosiery schedule, I shall explain, in the plainest possible language, one or two features of the transition from the Dingley bill to the Payne bill which the country ought to understand. In the first place it was contended by manufacturers and workingmen alike that the Dingley rates were not sufficient to protect this country against

the manufactories of Chemnitz and other foreign hosiery manufacturing centers. On certain popular grades which were largely imported under the Dingley law a barrier of 50 cents per dozen, with an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent, was raised at the customhouse. This barrier, taken for purposes of illustration, was not sufficient to check foreign imports enough to enable the American mills to run full time. Our workmen were given half time, or slack work, under this law. The Payne law raised the barrier from 50 cents per dozen plus 15 per cent ad valorem to 70 cents per dozen plus 15 per cent ad valorem; that is, the barrier was raised just 20 cents per dozen on these popular grades.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not wish the gentleman to interrupt me until I finish this illustration, and then I will yield.

Mr. FOWLER. All right.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The German cost of overhead charges being about one-half of those of the United States, and the labor cost being about one-third, we could not make hosiery upon this side of the water without a corresponding reduction in the cost of production. Under the Dingley law the unit foreign value of the popular grade of hosiery to which I now refer was 95 cents per dozen. The tariff barrier raised the value of those goods when imported into this country to \$1.59 per dozen on their arrival here.

That is to those of you who do not wear silk stockings, and to myself. [Laughter.]

It goes without saying, therefore, that if the German manufacturer could make these goods and deliver them on the other side for 95 cents per dozen, and the importer could pay the duty, bringing the value up to \$1.59 per dozen, when they came into competition with American makes on this side of the water it would not be long before every American manufacturer and every workman employed by him would be out of business and the American market would be given over to those who can the more readily make cheap hosiery upon the other side. Now that was the reason for the insistent demand for an increase in the rates upon hosiery.

BUT THE GERMAN KEPT GOING.

Because of the inroads German-made goods were making upon American mill productions, and in response to the demand of the American mill workers, the Payne law gave the additional barrier of 20 cents, raising the duty as it now is to 70 cents per dozen plus 15 per cent ad valorem. Now, let us see how it affected the situation. Did the German manufacturer cease to send his goods into the United States? No; he did nothing of the sort. Still keen for the American market, and fully aware of his advantages over the American manufacturer, he reduced his own cost of production and incidentally the already miserable wages paid his employees in order to meet the new tariff conditions.

He met us when our prices went up by putting his prices down. He met us when we tried to pay our help more by reducing his labor pay, and through the connivance of the great importers of this country he still continues to get his goods in, and that is the reason why under the Payne law the hosiery mills have not been doing much more business than they did under the Dingley law. We attempted to protect, but we did not protect enough.

BARRIER NOT HIGH ENOUGH.

The barrier was not sufficiently high. They met us upon our own ground. They came in under the fence, and they are here to-day, and the rates under the Payne law, which you call iniquitous, are still insufficient to bar the ill-paid foreign-made hosiery. Customhouse figures, which I now have before me and which I shall insert in the Record, clearly indicate that the moment the Payne law became effective the foreign manufacturer at once prepared to meet the new American conditions, and that on the particular grade of hosiery which we are using for the purpose of illustration, he cut down the foreign selling value from 95 cents, as it was under the Dingley law, to 87 cents. At least, this was the price to which he had gone down in June, 1911. And it is an interesting fact that while he cut the foreign selling value from 95 cents under the Dingley law to 87 cents under the Payne law, cutting his profits 8 cents on the dozen, the importer who paid the duty and brought the goods into this country to compete with American-made goods brought them in at \$1.59 under the Dingley law and rose only to \$1.65 per dozen under the Payne law. In other words, while the foreign value was cut 8 cents a dozen the importer's value was cut only 6 cents a dozen, while the price to the consumer in the United States remains at exactly the same figures under the Payne law as it was under the Dingley law.

Mr. FOWLER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER]?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has control of the time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to keep my agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used an hour and thirty minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield for one question.

MORE ABOUT HOSE.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] says that the Payne law raised the tariff on hosiery as it was fixed in the Dingley law. I ask him now if it is not a fact that that raise was made on the first three grades of stockings, and if on the first of them, which cost not above a dollar a dozen, that raise was not made 20 cents a dozen; on those that did not cost above \$1.50 a dozen, if that raise was not made 25 cents a dozen; and on those which cost over \$1.50 and not over \$2 a dozen, if the raise was not made 20 cents; and on the other three grades, the rich grades, there was no raise made at all?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that the duty was raised upon these grades that go into competition with the manufacturers of the United States; the duty was raised with a view of enabling the American manufacturers to compete with the cheap-made goods from other countries.

Mr. FOWLER. That was on the poor grades?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; the poor grades have been taxed by the Underwood bill and the higher grades lowered.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not talking about the Underwood bill. I desire to be honest with the gentleman about the matter. I want to know if it is not a fact now that these three poor grades of stockings were not raised in duty, as I have indicated?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say the raise was made on the grades wherein the Germans had the advantage of us in competition; wherein our workmen were being put out of employment and our mills prevented from operating on that grade of goods. We raised the duty so as to make the terms equal, and so that the American manufacturer could compete with the other countries.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to say one thing and then I am done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall have to ask the gentleman to excuse me. I am cutting this materially in order to be fair to gentlemen on the other side.

PROFIT PER DOZEN EXPLAINED.

It is obvious, therefore, that the Payne law did not increase the price to the consumer, although it did bring increased revenue to the Government, and gave additional impetus to American capital and industry. And to this statement should be added the further information that, because of the reduction of the cost of production in German mills and the threat of a Democratic revision of tariff, the American mills have not been able to work to their full capacity at any time since the Payne law was enacted. Before leaving this subject I should also say that, whereas on the popular grade of hosiery to which I have referred, the German manufacturer can produce and deliver in Germany, at 87 cents a dozen, the labor cost alone to the American manufacturer making similar goods is 74 cents. It does not require a great stretch of imagination nor much mathematical calculation to understand why a manufacturer employing labor in this country at 74 cents demands the protection of a tariff barrier against a foreign manufacturer who can build his mill, buy his machinery, provide the raw material, work up the yarn into the finished product, pay his labor and provide for pensions—as they do in Germany—all within the limit of 87 cents.

PRICE OF RAW COTTON COUNTS.

It is said that 1½ pounds of cotton will make a dozen pairs of hosiery such as I have described. If cotton is worth 15 cents a pound, 26 cents is at once to be charged to the American price for a dozen pairs of hosiery. But raw cotton, like raw wool, must necessarily be treated and spun into yarn before it is available for knitting. All this requires outlay for plant, machinery, and labor. American manufacturers have gone forth in good faith to provide American consumers with an American-made article. They have appealed to the Ways and Means Committee to be allowed to continue their business on terms that will enable them to compete with foreign manufacturers. They have more than \$800,000,000 invested in the various industries allied with cotton production, and in the manufacturing branch have employed more than 370,000 men and women. These are considerations which an American Congress ought not to deliberately ignore.

PAYNE AND DINGLEY IMPORTS COMPARED.

Imports of cotton hosiery for the month of June, 1911, at the ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Chicago.

Payne Law rates.	Dozens.	Foreign value.	Unit foreign value.	Duty.	Unit landing value.
30 per cent.....	17,898.08	\$9,229.00	\$0.515	\$2,758.70	\$0.669
70-15 per cent.....	44,016.00	38,727.75	.879	34,257.96	1.658
85-15 per cent.....	36,502.57	49,412.75	1.350	38,439.11	2.400
90-15 per cent.....	39,783.32	75,730.00	1.900	47,164.50	3.089
1.20-15 per cent.....	1,311.45	3,517.75	2.680	2,101.37	4.280
2.00-15 per cent.....	303.00	1,145.25	3.779	777.79	6.346
55 per cent.....	147.00	1,115.00	7.590	618.75	11.790
Total.....	139,961.42	178,877.50	1.278	126,118.18	2.179

Unit values August 5, 1909, Dingley law.

Rates.	Foreign.	Landing.
30 per cent.....	\$0.56	\$0.74
50-15 per cent.....	.95	1.59
60-15 per cent.....	1.36	2.12
70-15 per cent.....	1.91	2.89
1.20-15 per cent.....	2.70	4.30
2.00-15 per cent.....	3.86	6.44
55 per cent.....	6.46	10.02

NO MARKET FOR KNIT GOODS IN CANADA.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to hold the American market for hosiery and knit goods. We have little chance to compete with Germany or with England in the European market, and Japan is rapidly preparing to take care of the market in the Orient. We have done little in the way of expansion in the Latin-American Republics, and we have practically no chance to compete with Canada. The Ways and Means Committee is slightly concerned about our prospects in the territory "adjacent to the Red Sea" (p. 10), but upon this subject I believe the House will be content, as the committee is not, to await the report of the much ignored but busily occupied Tariff Board. The Canadian condition, however, is worthy of comment. Here is a report from the American vice consul general at Halifax, Nova Scotia, which shows clearly why we are denied the Canadian market. They have a tariff there and know how to use it against us, despite reciprocity in other things.

NO MARKET FOR KNIT GOODS IN CANADA.

There is practically no trade in American knit goods in Halifax. This is accounted for by the fact that the Canadian tariff on such articles is high, and the dealers consequently find it cheaper to buy from Canadian and English manufacturers.

The only knit goods from the United States that are sold in any quantity are novelties. However, when a demand for these novelties has been created, Canadian manufacturers soon produce a similar article and capture the market. American knit goods are not well known in this territory, as representatives rarely call and the American houses do not advertise their goods or in any way endeavor to get in touch with the local dealers.

On the other hand, representatives of Canadian and English manufacturers frequently confer personally with their prospective customers. Some Canadian concerns furnish the stores with placards for window displays, car advertising, and the like. Since the withdrawal of the surtax on goods of German origin last spring, more German salesmen are entering Canada. One dealer who has handled some American knit goods states that English manufacturers pack their wares more carefully than American manufacturers do, although the English concerns invariably charge for the boxing.

In order to establish themselves in this country, American manufacturers of knit goods must overcome the obstacle of a high tariff. Persistent personal representation, backed by goods of a high quality, is also a factor of prime importance in extending their trade here. Knitted goods of every description imported into Canada for the four months ended July, 1910, amounted to \$2,269 from the United Kingdom and \$1,214 from the United States.

WHY REDUCE WAGES?

In the correspondence heretofore submitted it is patent, I think, that increased importations are not calculated to reduce the cost of living in the United States, especially if those importations mean a curtailment of American enterprise and a displacement of American labor. I have never heard a Representative of a wheat-growing State demand lower prices for wheat, and I am equally sure I have never heard a loyal Representative of the South demand lower prices for cotton. We are great consumers of both wheat and cotton in the thickly populated districts, and we must have a purchasing power, which comes in the form of wages, to buy these commodities. If cotton goods which we manufacture are manufactured at one-third the cost in foreign countries, how can we continue to make the wage necessary to pay the existing prices for cotton or for wheat, and why should we have lower wages anyhow? The answer of the gentleman from Alabama, that we are deceiving the workingman, or that the manufacturer unduly profits by the tariff, is not convincing. The gentleman knows that the importer and the middle man are always between the manufacturer and the consumer. The high prices of which the

people complain are due not to the wage earner nor, generally, to the manufacturer, but to methods and expenses of manipulation and distribution. Take the Southern Wholesale Grocers' Association, which for a long time made its headquarters in Birmingham, Ala. Wherein did the tariff have anything to do with "the gentlemen's agreement," which prevented the consumer of foodstuffs from obtaining his necessary supplies, except at such prices as were fixed by the association? That the tariff had nothing to do with this method of increasing the actual cost of living and that the manufacturer of the foodstuffs was also out of it is best shown by the two suits for damages, one of which, in Birmingham, resulted in a financial settlement which involved a thousand dealers who were neither wage earners nor manufacturers directly protected by a tariff.

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR LIVING COST?

And that this subject of the increased cost of living in its relation to the tariff may be better understood, I append this extract from the personal letter of an official of the Government, who has been making some experiments of his own with regard to prices here and abroad. If the shoe pinches in any particular, I regret it, but this simple communication throws a great ray of light upon the maladroitness of the Democratic orators in charging up to the tariff the modern increase in the cost of living. My correspondent, whose name is reserved for personal reasons, writes as follows:

When I lived in Washington I saw at — an Austrian linen tablecloth and 12 napkins for it, which I fancied very much. This firm asked me \$40 for the tablecloth and napkins. Later I was in New York, and I found that the same articles could be purchased at — for \$33. I then corresponded with —, of Oxford Street, London, and from him I purchased identically the same articles, and after paying a duty of 50 per cent they cost me \$26.64. —, however, is on the west side of London, and I am informed that the tradespeople there charge from 25 to 33½ per cent on the wholesale price of the article. Last January I purchased from —, in London, a dozen towels, and after paying duty and postage they cost me \$13.32. The price of these towels in Boston is \$18. I bought at the same time three towels to complete a set, and after paying —, the customs duty, and the postage these towels cost me at the rate of \$16.20 per dozen. The retail price of these towels in New York and Boston is \$24 per dozen.

I was lately in London and I went into an establishment and bought a dozen handkerchiefs. I told them I wanted the same quality as the handkerchief I had in my possession, which cost me \$9 per dozen at —, in Philadelphia. The cost of these handkerchiefs was so low that after paying duty I find the total cost to be \$4.90 per dozen, or slightly more than half price. As the house I went into was a linen house, I presume that they gave me the same quality as — sold me. At the time I bought the handkerchiefs I bought a tablecloth, and after paying duty on it the cost was \$14.72. The price of identically the same tablecloth at —, on Chestnut Street, was \$21, and the price in New York at — was \$20. I have also purchased abroad underwear, and after paying duty the cost is about \$2 per garment. The same articles cost in Philadelphia \$2.50 each.

When I represent these facts to my friends they simply can not understand the situation since —, of Philadelphia, and —, of Washington, buy at the wholesale prices abroad and the duty is calculated at these wholesale prices, whereas I buy at the retail prices abroad and I am obliged to pay duty on such prices. I confess that I do not understand why the retail prices on these articles should be so high here. I know that Washington is an extortionate place, and I have found out that —, on F Street, Washington, charge \$20 for a set of glassware which I can purchase from —, of Philadelphia, at \$13.50.

I am sure you will agree with me that the retail merchants are charging the consumer too much profit on imported articles.

THOSE WHO REQUIRE SERVICE PAY.

I have another letter which will help us to a better understanding of this problem:

SCHRACK & SHERWOOD,
Philadelphia, July 11, 1911.

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: The textile interests of Philadelphia and, in fact, the whole country, are in a very bad condition, as you know and appreciate, owing to the tariff agitation, and I have read with interest your speeches in the House of Representatives in favor of the present Republican tariff, especially one of June 20, 1911, entitled "The tariff on a suit of clothes."

In connection with this subject I wish to hand you the inclosed advertisement and to supplement your arguments. In this case you will note the retailer (who is probably a strong supporter of Democratic tariff revision) buys a suit at \$16.75 and sells it to the consumer at \$30, making a gross profit of 79.1 per cent. Mr. W. H. Dixon, whose letter you read on June 20, gives in same an itemized statement of cost, which, in merchant tailoring, I think is a fair one, and he figures a gross profit of 21.5 per cent. He further states that a department store will not try to do business on less than 25 to 33½ per cent gross profit, and the above is an instance of where they have made 79.1 per cent on a suit of clothes, and, I warrant you, were that same suit, sold for \$30, dissected and tabulated down to the mill that made the cloth that the manufacturer was glad to get a gross profit of even 20 per cent, if he got that.

It is the manufacturer of yarns and cloth who will suffer, and not only he himself, but the thousands dependent on his investment for their daily bread. For example, we will suppose that the tariff on cloth is reduced so as to give the foreign manufacturers an even chance of selling in this market. Would such a condition benefit the consumer? I say positively no. The cloth would be bought in England. The suit would be made in England, sold wholesale for \$16.75, and resold in Philadelphia for \$30 just the same. The result to the consumer would be the same. To the manufacturer of the suit and his labor it would be the same. But as to the manufacturer of the cloth and his labor, the business would go to England, and he is out of business and thousands of mill operators are out of work. The money

which should have been kept in this country and paid to the weavers, winders, and spinners goes to pay that labor in another country.

Most people believe that to cheapen an article, such as clothing, the proper way is to get after the manufacturer of the cloth, mainly because foreigners with cheaper labor conditions can sell cloth in the United States duty free cheaper than the home manufacturer. The manufacturer stands as an exposed target to all guns, his business with its territorial extent is subject to foreign (outside United States) competition and needs protection, while the retailer's business is local and not subject to foreign competition. Take one item alone in the past year, that of the so-called hobble skirt; this has meant a reduction of at least 25 per cent in the demand for dress goods, and the manufacturer who has money invested in his business must stand the loss, and the consumer pays just as much for a skirt with 5 yards of goods in it as she does with 8 yards in it.

It is a mistaken idea, from any business man's standpoint, to try to down the manufacturers of this country by taking off the tariff; they should realize that the more money kept right here on our shores means business for everybody, but if you send money away the people do not have it to spend.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman, although I did not know I was trespassing on his territory when I referred to the hobble skirt. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to ask the gentleman a question. Yesterday the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], if I recollect correctly, said that 90 per cent of the laborers in the New England mills were foreigners. Is that true?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. For the sake of the argument I will admit that that is true, and I will explain it by saying that it is the best tribute in the world to the wages paid in the United States, since if these foreigners could not get better wages in the United States they would have remained in the countries from which they came.

Mr. HEFLIN. If that is true, is it not a fact that the southern mills are the only ones that furnish full employment to American labor?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is true, I regret to have heard it said on that side of the House during this discussion that the poorest-paid labor in the mills of the country was in the South. God help the Anglo-Saxon of the South! I do not want free trade to bear him down. I want to help improve his condition.

Mr. HEFLIN. The New England mills manufacture a finer grade and a more costly grade of goods than do our southern mills. You pretend to protect the American laborer's product from competition with the product of foreign labor. Let me ask what are you doing to protect the American laborer in his right to occupy a place in the American mills and not be driven out by the cheap labor of Europe?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We are attempting to prevent the Democratic Ways and Means Committee from putting into a law that which will create an influx of foreign commodities and labor, that will displace the labor to which you refer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEFLIN. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is.

Mr. Chairman, I am coming now to a point which I thought the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was about to inquire into. I continue to read from the letter of Mr. Albert G. Sherwood, of Philadelphia, which has in it some references which I desire to apply now to my distinguished and handsome friend on the other side, and I hope it will receive that consideration which it merits.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. O, Mr. Chairman, I speak now of my handsome friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to know whether the gentleman withdraws his charge that I am an expert in hobble skirts?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, I do now.

Mr. FOWLER. If he does not, I wanted to deny that proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Since the arrival of the gentleman from Alabama I withdraw everything I said about the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Sherwood's letter continues:

Now, a word as to the consumer. He feels that he is the one and only one who is oppressed. In one sense of the word he is, but only in certain cases, like the one above, where he has to pay \$30 for a suit that cost wholesale \$16.75, or where a monopoly is formed to restrain trade. The consumers do not realize that for the most part manufactured articles of all kinds are sold at a less profit and at a cheaper price to-day than they were 10 to 15 years ago. They do not realize that the farm productions—the things they eat—have not kept pace with the enormous growth of the cities. This naturally makes the demand greater than the supply and the prices higher. The States as well as the National Government know this, for they all are at great expense trying to increase farm production and efficiency.

Now, I invite the attention of the good-natured gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

The trouble—

Says Mr. Sherwood—

as far as I can see, is not with the tariff; it is the enormous growth and lack of economy. There are about twice as many inducements to catch the dollars of to-day as there were 15 years ago. Many a man to-day owns an automobile with a mortgage on his house, and of course it goes hard to buy clothes or any other necessity when he puts the money into luxuries.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, that does not refer to the gentleman from Alabama. [Laughter.]

A few years ago if a person wanted to buy anything, it was necessary to go to the stores and buy it, while now a man can sit at home, with a telephone on one side and an electric fan on the other and bring a hundred comforts to his very feet, but it all costs money, and that money should not be considered a part of the market value of the goods he buys, and if the people must have service, they are paying for service and not for the goods, and they should not blame the manufacturer for the high price of service.

There is a lot in this letter that does not pertain to tariff, but in closing I want, as a manufacturer, to commend you for your fight.

To take the tariff off, will injure all.

To leave it on, will injure no one.

Let us straighten out our internal questions of labor and economy before we let in foreign manufacturers and their products to further complicate the conditions.

Very truly, yours,

ALBERT G. SHERWOOD.

TRIBUTE TO KING COTTON.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I want to return to King Cotton. I have listened to the graceful eloquence of our southern friends, who have a just pride in the supremacy and world-wide influence of their great staple. They have watched it in their rich climate as nature brought it into bloom, and they have extolled it in prose and in poetry. It has been their treasured asset, and every true American has rejoiced with them in their proud possession. It has been of great commercial value to them and has stood by them in their hour of need. They have found it agreeable to market much of this great product abroad; some of them have encouraged the advance of American manufactures into the cotton field; and as encouragement has been given, capital has come forward and labor has been employed in shaping the fiber into artistic and useful articles of apparel. Tremendous expenditure of American money, earned by American enterprise and labor, is now so engaged. If proper encouragement against foreign competition were not denied, there is good reason to believe that the spirit of progress and enterprise would continue until the great new South shall no longer be a cotton-producing or agricultural country only, but a thriving, busy, prosperous manufacturing center as well.

SOME MAY BE SATISFIED.

It may be that, because of local conditions, some of our Democratic brethren are content that the South shall depend upon its cotton and its field labor, and that it shall be satisfied with the British and German gold which comes back into its banks from cotton sold abroad; but the more natural, if not the more patriotic view would suggest a closer alliance with capital and labor at home and a maintenance here of a higher standard of life and order. No American workingman, whether he labors in the field or in the factory, will be content to receive less than his modern wage, nor will any statesman deliberately strive to lower the standards or ideals of American life. If foreign wages be low, and we continue to encourage them by sending our raw material to be manufactured abroad, we must necessarily depress our own labor at home. If we had assurance that the encouragement of foreign manufactures would tend to advance the wages or standard of living in foreign countries, there would be some satisfaction in the thought that we were contributing to the general welfare of humanity, but there is no such assurance, and so long as foreign industrial conditions remain as they are, we can only depress the higher wage standards of the United States by forcing our workingmen into competition with low-priced labor abroad; or, worse than that, displace it altogether.

COURTIERS AT THE THRONE.

And after all it should be remembered that King Cotton is only one of the great American kings, all of whom pay tribute to him and some of whom, in the more rigorous regions of our country, pay him greater tribute than do those in the balmy climate where he reigns supreme. His subjects are as widespread as civilization and should not be oppressed by him where civilization has reached its highest standard. As in Holy Writ we are told that he is worse than an infidel "who provideth not for his own house," so we may say of King Cotton that he is unjust if he persisteth in providing for the competitors of his own house and bringeth distress upon those who sustain him. I do not believe King Cotton, that great allegorical figure that stands out so proudly with King Coal, King Wheat, King Corn, King Iron, and other towering giants in American progress, would give his official sanction to the bill

we are now considering if he understood the havoc it would work upon his loyal subjects; but as it is in humankind, so it may be figuratively, Mr. Chairman; the courtiers reaching out for political dominion, seeking favors at the foot of the throne, play upon the susceptibilities of the monarch and inconsiderately sweep the masses into subjection. In the dim distance loom up the rich political possessions of 1912, and it may be that some of the flatterers of the mighty King Cotton are laying plans to profit at the expense of his benign and better judgment. Let us hope it is not so—that no cabal of the courtiers lurks behind the measure for which the support of the king is sought. If it does, Mr. Chairman, let us hope that it may be detected and overthrown before disaster follows in the wake of progress. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset of my remarks I want to say that the pending bill commands my unqualified and most earnest support, not only because it is the product of a Democratic Committee on Ways and Means, not only because it has the indorsement of a Democratic caucus, not only because it is strictly in the line of pledges in the platforms of our party and in harmony with the best traditions of that party, but because I conceive it to be a measure that is democratic in the broadest significance of that term—working the largest good to the largest number. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If I did not firmly believe that its ultimate effect will be to benefit the cotton producer, as well as the cotton manufacturer, if I did not feel sure that the consumer of cotton goods will be benefited by it, if I were not convinced that it will be a long step in the direction of giving us new markets for our wares, I would not appear in advocacy of it.

Being a cotton grower in the State of Georgia, living on my plantation, operating and directing it, I feel that I am justified—nay, that it is my duty—to speak to this House in behalf of my fellow farmers all over this country, but especially those of the South; to plead, not for special privileges, but for equity and justice in dealing with this greatest of all industries, the fountain head, the very source from which flows the material prosperity of the Nation. It is more than a trite saying—it is a monumental fact—that agriculture is the foundation rock upon which a nation's wealth is built. [Applause.]

The farmer's prosperity is the electric motor that sends the life-giving current into every nerve and artery of the business community. When the farmer flourishes, all flourish; when his pocketbook is empty, there is decided ebb in those of other pursuits. Agriculture in its highest, in its best estate sets a people as a mark upon a hill. That has been its history since first the command went forth, "Let the earth bring forth fruit!" From the day when the first plow was a stick with a nail at the end of it to scratch the soil it has held this undisputed sway; and in our own time and generation it is the truest exponent, as it is the clearest result of brawn and brain and science. It is the creator of wealth. [Applause.]

So important a factor in the economic life of the people has a right to demand that in the matter of legislation it be treated with absolute fairness. The greatest glory of the farmer is that he has never asked for special privileges or favors. [Applause.] He requires none. He asks nothing except that, in the adjustment of economic relations, he be not discriminated against. When tariff bills have been in the course of incubation no delegations of farmers have thronged the committee rooms, nor have farmers sent high-priced lawyers to Washington to make specious arguments for special concessions. "The square deal" has been his shibboleth always. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If that is true—and it is true—of the farmer in general, it is markedly so in respect of the southern farmer. It was strikingly illustrated in word and action by Representatives of southern agricultural districts during the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill in this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am serving, Mr. Chairman, one of the most important and prosperous districts not only in Georgia, but in the South. Georgia is properly rated the Empire State of the South—first in peach production, second only to Texas in cotton production, high among the leaders in all fruits and all cereals, second only to Alabama in iron ore, among the first in all minerals, leading all in general variety of all the sources of wealth and the elements of progressiveness.

My district is second to no district in Georgia as to cotton and cereals. From this great agricultural district there did not come to me a single plea to oppose the Canadian reciprocity

bill; on the contrary, I received many earnest requests that I give it my cordial support.

That bill, though emanating from a Republican President and urged in the Senate of the United States by "stand-pat" Republicans with such good grace as they could command, was supported in this House and in the Senate by the Democrats, because it represented a vindication of economic principles for which Democrats had pleaded for years in State and national platforms. It was the actual manifestation of "a Democratic principle and a Republican conversion." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It was amusing, Mr. Chairman, almost to the point of pathos, to hear on the floor of this House the plaintive appeals that came from our friends on the other side in behalf of the farmers—a class whom Republican legislation has insistently discriminated against by granting special aid and comfort to infant industries of corporation maturity with accumulated millions in their coffers. [Applause.] During all the years that the Republican Party has been in power in every department of the Government it has never given much consideration to the needs of the farmer, but rather has ignored him throughout. Instead of guarding his birthright of fair-dealing, it has sought to keep him quiet with such a mess of pottage as import duties on corn and wheat and cabbage—agricultural products in which we lead all the world.

The farmer needs no protection; certainly the southern farmer does not. He not only raises that which sustains life, but also that which clothes the bodies of nearly 70 per cent of the people of the world. Next to the corn crop the cotton crop is the largest item in the money value of the products of the farm. The southern farmer needs no protection other than that of "a fair field and no favors." He is more than willing to have the price of his products regulated by the law of supply and demand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmer only demands that his cotton shall no longer be the gamblers' sport and stake. He demands that this great staple no longer be permitted to be the shuttlecock in the hands of speculators and manipulators, who for years have saddled it with fictitious values below the actual market value. I am tempted to quote briefly right here from a report of the commissioner of corporations, made a few years ago, on the subject of cotton "futures":

The matter may be summed up as follows: The abnormal depression of the future contract price, caused by improper exchange regulation, taken with the system of "buying limits," frequently draws down with it and away from the standard of true values the prices which the farmers receive for their cotton. The mental effect of these erroneous quotations serves to mislead the farmer to his injury in setting his crop. The disturbance of the hedging function by improper exchange conditions has placed an added cost on the merchant, which must necessarily fall, at least in part, upon the producer. The basic defect of the fixed difference system is that it inevitably causes the promulgation and practical use of false quotations of a great staple. "Future" contracts should truly represent actual cotton. If they do not, if the two lines of prices are divorced, the two chief functions of the exchange, the hedging system and the quoting of standard prices, are nullified, and the exchange loses the prime characteristics which distinguish a real market from a gambling place.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that this House has set the stamp of its approval upon the kind of protection the cotton growers need by passing in the second session of the last Congress a bill, H. R. 24073, prohibiting gambling in futures, and I regret that that meritorious measure failed of favorable action in the Senate. But I confidently look forward to a renewed attack upon these cormorants, who feed upon the life blood of the thrifty farmer, and trust that the next one may be carried to a successful conclusion. If it should fail to be carried into enactment, it will surely become an issue before the people in the presidential election of 1912, and the great army of tillers of the soil will have no difficulty in placing the responsibility where it belongs and vote accordingly.

In some quarters it is objected that the lower rates of duty on imports of manufactures of cotton which this bill proposes will cause a flood of importations of cotton goods made by Europe's cheaper labor that will enter into disastrous competition with the products of our mills. Such apprehensions I regard as not based upon existing facts. The very comprehensive report of the Committee on Ways and Means accompanying this bill states:

It is estimated that in 1910 the imports of all manufactures of cotton were only about 8 per cent of the domestic consumption.

There is no doubt about that, as the report says:

Our manufacturers are well equipped to supply the domestic market, and should gradually become better equipped to supply foreign markets.

These last few words point to the really important feature for the manufacturer of cotton goods in this country to consider. His home market is practically secure to him. He will have no difficulty in holding his own there; in the future he will sup-

ply, as he has supplied in the past, our own people with practically all they require in the way of manufactured cotton goods.

In dealing with this subject it is not amiss to turn for a moment from generalization to specific facts. While pretty nearly everybody knows that the United States leads the world in cotton growing, it is of interest to note that we produce 59.9 per cent, or three-fifths of the world's supply. British India is next with 18.3 per cent; then Egypt with 8; Russia is fourth with 4.7 per cent; China fifth with 3.8; Brazil sixth with 1.9; and all other countries supply the balance of 3.4 per cent. These figures are taken from Census Bulletin No. 111.

Our cotton crop has grown from a few thousand bales in 1800 to the present enormous figure of more than 12,000,000 bales. The average annual production of cotton in the United States for the past five years has been 12,175,867 bales, of which Georgia has about 15 per cent to her credit. Georgia's largest crop was in 1908—1,980,610 bales. In 1910 the South produced 12,005,888 bales of 480 pounds each. The average value of lint per pound, upland, was 14.7 per cent. In 1909 we produced 10,315,382 bales of an average weight of 475 pounds, and it was sold at an average price of 14.3. We consumed 4,559,002 and exported 6,491,843 bales. We imported only 151,395 bales, or 1.47 per cent of our home production—truly an almost negligible quantity.

The cotton-manufacturing industry of the country has forged ahead with enormous strides. A preliminary report of the Census Bureau shows the following percentages of increase from 1899 to 1909: In number of establishments, 63.8; capital invested, 184.5; spindles, 141.8; looms, 508; bales of cotton consumed, 66.1; value of products, 143.1.

On the other hand, let us glance at the statistics bearing upon the importation of cotton cloth and wearing apparel. The Government publication called Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1910, issued by the Bureau of Statistics, makes this showing, pages 546 to 550:

	1907	1908	1909	1910
Cloths, unbleached.....	\$11,496,734	\$6,930,007	\$12,381,384	\$10,098,985
Cloths, bleached.....	2,240,431	1,529,057	2,146,117	1,351,040
Cloths, dyed, colored, or printed.....	7,502,082	5,809,019	7,165,579	8,521,466
Clothing and other wearing apparel—knit goods.....	(1)	1,482,751	1,016,325	1,175,147
All other.....	4,794,226	3,218,728	3,230,342	4,549,921
Total.....	26,033,478	18,969,562	25,939,947	25,696,559

¹ Clothing and wearing apparel was included in "all other" prior to 1908.

While the United States grows nearly 60 per cent of the world's cotton, we manufacture only a little over 25 per cent of the world's supply of manufactures of cotton.

Right here is where the ingenuity of the American manufacturer of cotton goods must stand the test. His home market is safe; but if he would expand his business, if he would consume more raw cotton, so that less may be shipped abroad, he must find ways to push more energetically into the world's markets. He must contend with British and German manufacturers for the trade in countries where little else than cotton goods are worn by the natives. He can not afford to sit supine and allow these markets to be practically monopolized by foreigners. I shall make bold right here to say to our American manufacturers that if they will but cater to the notions of the Chinese or South Americans or Africans in regard to the manner of putting up his wares instead of consulting merely his own tastes, he will have taken a long step forward toward getting his proper share of their trade. Feeling superior to these customers—and our people are superior in many ways—our manufacturers have failed to respect their views and desires as do the European manufacturers. We must sell them what they want; not what we think they should have. We must pack it or fix it up like they want it; not to suit our own pleasure or convenience. The reports of our consuls to foreign countries continually emphasize the advantage won by Europeans over Americans in competition for foreign trade by catering to the customs, notions, and desires of the purchasers. That our merchants and manufacturers will soon learn this, I do not doubt.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the American manufacturer has nothing to fear ultimately from the legislation which we are now considering, for in the end it will stimulate trade and increase the large total of his profits. Nothing is more certain than that lower prices will increase consumption, and the greater the demand for his goods the greater the number of his employees.

Best of all, Mr. Chairman—and I shall take no pains to conceal my pleasurable anticipation—best of all is this, that the in-

creasing demand for cotton goods must work to the benefit of the cotton planter. Nor shall I hesitate to express intense satisfaction at the prospect of seeing more and more of New England's cotton manufacturers transplanting their mills to the South, near the fields where their staple grows.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the logical concomitant of the revised woolen schedule which I hope to see coming forth from conference unscathed and submitted to the President for his approval. They say he will veto it. So much the worse for him and his party if he does. For he himself has said:

That Schedule K of the Payne-Aldrich Act is indefensible.

How, then, would he justify before the people of the United States his veto of a measure that aims at remedying, in some degree at least, the legislative crimes in the act upon which the President himself has set the seal of his condemnation? Pardon the digression.

This bill is not the hasty product of undigested material handled by careless or nonobservant legislators. Every detail has been carefully considered. It commends itself to the "common man" by its simplicity. It does away with the confusing compound duties. Every man can understand the ad valorem method of laying import taxes. Any schoolboy will know that if a given article costs a dollar and the tax is 25 per cent, the duty to be paid on that article is 25 cents.

Under the previous arrangement of the cotton schedule, with its ramifications as to so many threads to the square inch and sundry and diverse other complications, it takes a Philadelphia lawyer or a tariff expert to say what import duty a given article must pay. This is an additional reason why I favor this bill, though its chiefest merit, of course, is the cutting down of the iniquitously high rates of the Payne-Aldrich tariff. Why, Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes a law we need not be afraid lest our socks wear out too soon, for it will not take a small fortune to buy more.

I experience especial satisfaction also in the passage of the farmers' free-list bill. If that is placed on the statute book it will give our farmers what they have desired and deserved for years and years—ever, in fact, since the Republican Party joined hands with the International Harvester Co.—which means the Agricultural Implement Trust. They will get cheaper plows, cheaper reapers, cheaper binders, cheaper farming machinery of every kind.

Farming can not be carried on to-day without improved machinery. The mountainous tariff that is now laid on such machinery practically prohibits its importation. The worst of it all is—and that is what galls our farmers, Mr. Chairman—that while they have to pay these exactions to the trust the manufacturers ship these same implements abroad and sell them to the farmers of foreign countries at prices lower than are paid on this side of the water. So the American farmer is mulcted for the benefit of the foreigner. The farmers' free-list bill will go far toward doing away with these discriminations and injustices.

The protection the farmers need is against the gross injustice perpetrated upon them by and under the sanction of the Government, which compels them, through high-tariff exactions, to pay millions every year, not to augment the revenues of the Government, but to pile upon and over the already bursting coffers of greedy monopolies. I am unable to understand, Mr. Chairman, how any Representative can justify himself before his people in opposing by speech or vote legislation like this bill designed to make up for these inequalities.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer has already been the "goat" too long. While to others have been given the soft places, he has been riding on the rocks. It is high time that he should have a change of treatment. Long enough has he been in the uncomfortable position between the upper and the nether millstones.

According to the National Grange, the farmer gets about 35 cents for every dollar's worth he produces and the middlemen get the 65 cents. Might it not be well if the farmer got the 65 cents and left the 35 cents for the middlemen? The Independent gives other examples:

During the fall of 1910 apples were largely purchased from the farmer in the orchard at \$1.50 a barrel; but these very apples were sold in our city markets at \$6.50 per barrel and were retailed for over \$9 per barrel. During this same fall the orange crop of Florida was bought up for 85 cents per box, but in the market was scarce at \$2.50 to \$3 for the common grades. The egg case is just as one-sided, when the producer gets but 20 cents while the consumer pays 40. Of course, the farmer who has cold storage of his own can command the highest prices, provided he also be prepared to directly reach the consumer.

The farmer has been whipped with the scourges of an outrageous tariff and tortured with the scorpions of an equally outrageous system of "futures." He has been the football of the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges, and when they got through with him he would have given up the ghost if he had not been a farmer, and an American farmer at that. His

grit saved him, and that is why he has not been wiped out altogether.

To show that in the expression of my own views I am reflecting the views held generally by the good people from whom I come, I quote a brief editorial from a Georgia country weekly:

[McDuffie Progress, published at Thomson, Ga.]

WHO IS SELLING THE COTTON?

If Attorney General Wickersham desires to do a real service to his country, the southern people as well as the Nation at large, he will now direct his attention to the New York Cotton Exchange, where more cotton has been sold in the last 10 days than the crop of 1911 will aggregate. It may be that no national law has been violated, but the Attorney General could find out that a great damage was being done to the financial interests of his country and he could recommend to Congress such legislation as would put to an end forever the nefarious practice of people selling in enormous quantities that which they do not possess nor for which they have any contract, right, or title.

As a matter of fact, it is well known the world over that the cotton exchanges have been maintained and are still being maintained for two purposes, viz, to afford a place for gambling in futures; and secondly, to afford a place where the bear element, representing the spinners of the world, can fix the prices of cotton at the lowest possible point.

There might be some inducement for the Attorney General to desire the price of cotton to go low and remain low were it not for the fact that the cotton crop is the principal crop that brings the gold of Europe to America and keeps the balance of the trade on this side of the waters. Cut it out and in a few short years the gold coin of the American Government must be turned in a steady stream across the Atlantic, there to remain. This is known to the Attorney General, and it is also known to the Southern Members of Congress, and if they expect to take any action to suppress this national as well as sectional evil now is the time for them to do it.

We call special attention to the Attorney General for the simple reason that a little more than 12 months ago, when the cotton bulls were putting forth as heroic efforts to put up the price of cotton as the bears are now putting forth to put down the price of cotton, the Attorney General was the most active and vigorous man in the American Union to thwart their plans, even though it brought the gold of Europe and the rest of the world to the American shore.

Let our Congressmen and our Senators get busy and enact a law not extinguishing the exchanges entirely, but simply providing that a man must have what he sells. If this was done the sales of the New York Cotton Exchange would be valid sales and the price of cotton would forever remain at such a figure that the southern people would have a reasonable return for their labor and efforts in furnishing clothing for the world.

In all I have said, Mr. Chairman, I have been moved only by the solicitude I feel for the class to which I belong—the farmers. It is their welfare, their claim to consideration, their title to equity and to justice that stirs my sympathies and fashions my language. They do not belong to the “special interests” of which we hear so much. They send no special pleaders either to the White House or to the Capitol. But they are tired of being humbugged. They are weary of this three-card monte game which the Republican Party has been playing upon them so long. They are tired of being told again, as they have been told so often, that they must possess their souls in patience until the Tariff Board can conduct some more investigations into rates, cost of manufacture, and so on.

I think the situation, so far as tariff revision by the Republican Party is concerned, has been concisely and correctly stated by the Committee on Ways and Means in its report on this bill. On page 30 of that report we find this paragraph:

The attitude of the Republican administration indicates that the Republican platform statements of 1908 about differences in the cost of production at home and abroad are not to be taken too seriously when rates of duty can be put higher for the advantage of special interests; and later events indicate that investigations and compilations of statistical data, made by a Tariff Board under the exclusive control of the President, concerning the ever-varying and constantly fluctuating costs of production, are to be used principally for the purpose of delaying and, if possible, defeating legislation to make duties lower for the welfare of the people.

The course of the Democratic Party on this bill, Mr. Chairman, as in all the legislation that has been enacted, or attempted to be enacted, on these important subjects this session, has its source in even-handed justice to all the people. We have not sought to conserve or advance the interests of a class or a section, but we have striven to deal justly and fairly by all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When the first session of the Sixty-second Congress closes the Democrats can look back upon their work in serene contentment, conscious of having redeemed at least a portion of the promises on the strength of which the people put them in power. In a few months more the Senate of the United States will also take on a Democratic complexion [applause on the Democratic side], and in November, 1912, the people of the United States will, I feel confident, “make it unanimous” by electing a Democrat to the Chief Magistracy of the Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And when we are in control of the three branches of the Government—the House, the Senate, and the Presidency—whereby the political policy of the country is shaped and its legislation written, I am proudly confident, Mr. Chairman, that we will hold aloft the beautiful banner bearing the noble inscription of “Equal rights to all and special privileges to none,”

and that we will place that blessed doctrine upon the statute books in the interest of all the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not insensible to the lateness of the hour and I shall try not to delay the House any longer than it is possible to complete what I have to say. There are two important ways, I think, for us to serve our people. One is in legislating to impose the burdens of taxation as lightly as possible upon the people of the country. That a Democratic House has endeavored very diligently to do this session and is succeeding admirably, I think. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Another is to conserve the expenditures of the Government, and it seems to me that this is of no less importance than the other which I have just mentioned. In the early history of our Government there were provided, for the purpose of guarding sacredly the expenditures of the public money by the Congress or by the different departments of Government, certain committees charged with the duty of investigating annually the manner in which the money was expended by the different executive departments of the Government. For the last 30 years under Republican rule in this country these committees have done practically nothing. This year with the House Democratic, it was concluded, and I think wisely, by those in charge that these expenditure committees should become live, active committees and perform the duties imposed upon them by the law and the rules of this House. I speak to-night particularly of one of those committees. I have the honor to be chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department. Our committee went early to work and we have worked honestly and diligently and have developed one situation which I desire to speak of for a few moments. Almost every transaction that has been called to our attention so far that had the appearance of not being perhaps, well what it ought to be, led directly to what is known in the State Department, as the emergency or secret fund. This fund is peculiar to the State Department. Each year we appropriated a certain amount of money to be used by the President and the Secretary of State for so-called emergency purposes, or for “intercourse or treaty with foreign nations.” This last year this appropriation amounted to \$90,000. For the last several years it has been about \$75,000 a year, but is now gradually increasing. The President and Secretary of State claim under the law that they can not be compelled to account to Congress or to any committee thereof or to any living person for the expenditure of this money. They claim it was given to them for secret purposes, and therefore they are not required to account, and they have positively declined to account, to a committee appointed by this House especially charged with an investigation of that department.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am just informed that there was an agreement made this afternoon in my absence that debate hereafter would be confined to the cotton schedule.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To-night. That was the understanding. I did not understand the gentleman was going to talk on anything but the cotton schedule.

Mr. HAMLIN. I understood there was an agreement in regard to general debate, but I was not here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not so understand the order, but understood that the business this evening should be confined to debate only, and not on any particular subject, as the Chair understood it. The Clerk informs the Chair that is the order that was made.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I merely desire to say I overheard the understanding between the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from New York, and it was that the discussion to-night should be confined to the cotton bill. I did not want to raise the point, and for that reason brought it to the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] who is in charge upon the other side. I do not care to make the point, because it has been brought up in an amicable way, but I submit to the Chair that was the understanding.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I heard the colloquy this afternoon between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the majority floor leader. The gentleman from New York speaks very low and indistinctly at times, but my general impression is, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the debate this evening was to be confined to the cotton bill.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, if that is true, I have no inclination in the world to violate the agreement. I did not know that that was the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair is that it was to be confined solely to debate.

Mr. HAMLIN. On no particular subject?

The CHAIRMAN. No particular subject, as I understand from the Clerk was mentioned. The Chair does not know what any outside agreement may have been.

Mr. HAMLIN. If I am in order, of course I would like now to proceed, but I do not wish to proceed if there is any gentleman thinks I am out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say that just as soon as the Clerk returns to the desk the Chair will find out if there was anything different stated.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I heard the agreement, and I feel sure that the only thing the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] had in mind was that there would be no votes taken in order to dispose of other matters. I do not think he mentioned there would be no speeches made on other subjects. Always on occasions like this, of general debate, Members have been allowed to speak about anything they wished to speak about. I really think that was what he meant, although I do not know.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may be permitted to proceed upon any subject he desires to speak upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the order prohibits the gentleman from discussing any subject. The order, as it appears at the Clerk's desk, was that the proceedings of the evening were to be confined solely to debate. Of what took place between the gentlemen outside the Chair has no knowledge, nor have the clerks at the desk any knowledge of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have every desire to hear the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN], and would not for a moment make the point of order except there was a distinct understanding, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who expressed to me his inability to be here to-night and asked me to represent this side of the House, did say that the understanding was that the discussion was to be confined to the cotton bill. With that statement I submit the matter to the chairman and the committee. I do not desire to make the point of order, but that was the understanding and I am quite sure it would be confirmed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] if he were here.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference, did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] hear that agreement this evening?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There was a colloquy between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] observes, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] speaks lowly and sometimes does not hear well, but there was a slight difference of opinion as to what the recess should be for, and there was also a question as to whether the point of no quorum should be raised. I remember that. That was not pressed, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] did say to me upon retiring that the understanding was that the debate should be confined to the cotton schedule, and I understood that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] had acquiesced in that agreement.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the reporter's notes would show exactly what the agreement was, but I was standing nearly between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] when the agreement was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The order will be here in one moment.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I wish to state emphatically that there was no agreement made between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that the debate should be confined exclusively to the cotton schedule. The agreement was that no business should be transacted except the business of general debate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman permit me to suggest that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOWMAN] recalls the incident and conversation; and may be called upon to verify my statement.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] has the floor.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire at all to embarrass the gentlemen here or embarrass myself by seemingly attempting to discuss something that some gentlemen thought was not to be discussed to-night, and I believe under those cir-

cumstances I would prefer to yield back my time and risk getting recognition at some other time.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULLOP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12812, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m., August 2, 1911.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13002) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the funds of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 94), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1671) to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of the North American Indian, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 93), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 144) to legalize a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, in Stevens County, Wash., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 101), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1149) permitting the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the St. Croix River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 102), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOULD, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2732) to authorize the Providence, Warren & Bristol Railroad Co. and its lessee, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Palmers or Warren River, in the State of Rhode Island, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 99), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOEKE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1627) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across and over the Arkansas River, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 100), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOREMUS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2766) to authorize the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. to construct and operate a bridge across the St. Francis River, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 97), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2768) to authorize the St. Louis-Kansas City Electric Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the town of Weldon Springs Landing, Mo., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 98), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill

of the Senate (S. 850) to amend an act entitled "An act to legalize and establish a pontoon railway bridge across the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, and to authorize the construction of a similar bridge at or near Clinton, Iowa," approved June 6, 1874, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 95), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CULLOP, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2878) to authorize the Chicago, Lake Shore & Eastern Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River in the State of Indiana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 96), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 13161) for the enlargement of the Federal building at Kansas City, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 13162) to provide for the construction of a military and post road through Columbiana and Stark Counties, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13163) to amend sections 4438, 4439, and 4440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13164) to amend section 5 of an act of Congress approved June 9, 1910, entitled "An act to amend the laws for preventing collision of vessels and to regulate equipment of certain motor boats on the navigable waters of the United States"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13165) to amend section 4477 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 259) to print additional copies of document entitled "Drainage survey of certain lands in Minnesota"; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 140) making an appropriation of \$3,000 to pay the cost of printing a connected map of the United States, showing the routes of the principal explorers and early roads and highways; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 13166) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13167) granting an increase of pension to Le Roy Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13168) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Strayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 13169) granting a pension to Mary Ann Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13170) granting a pension to Lillian Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13171) granting a pension to Nathan O. Haines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13172) granting a pension to Carrie Trump; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13173) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gano; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13174) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Stowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 13175) granting a pension to Catherine Werner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 13176) granting an increase of pension to John J. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13177) granting a pension to Nancy J. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13178) granting a pension to Joe Griffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13179) granting a pension to George A. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13180) granting a pension to Jesse K. Drinnen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13181) granting an increase of pension to William H. Boley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13182) granting an increase of pension to John R. Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13183) for the relief of Thomas Colyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13184) for the relief of Levi Viles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13185) to correct the military record of Samuel Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13186) to correct the military record of J. B. Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13187) to correct the military record of Nelson Stover; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 13188) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Blackford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13189) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Newton Strickler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 13190) granting a pension to Cornelia Ewing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 13191) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Donns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Resolutions passed by Cincinnati Seed Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, protesting against passage of bill requiring leaf dealers to specify and report exact type of tobacco on hand, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolution of the Alameda County Pharmaceutical Society, of Oakland, Cal., in opposition to House bill 8887, providing for a stamp tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of numerous citizens of California, asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINDRED: Petition for the preservation of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of Rev. E. Wooley and others of Highland, Mich., protesting against the passage of the Johnston Sunday bill (S. 237); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Resolutions of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, condemning the manner of the arrest of the McNamaras and indorsing the Berger resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTTER: Petitions of numerous citizens of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring the bill to establish a department of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, August 2, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

DELIVERY OF MAIL FROM MOVING TRAINS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 23, 1911, certain information relative to the causes of injuries to persons and damage and destruction of mail and mail equipment from accidents resulting from delivering and receiving mail to and from moving trains, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. No. 81.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. RANDALL of Texas, Mr. HARRISON of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DALZELL managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2958) to